

The Classical Review

MAY 1909

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE TEACHING OF LATIN AND THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTIONS OF SYNTAX.

Der Mensch begreift niemals wie anthropomorphisch er ist.—GOETHE.

THE teaching of Latin in the schools and colleges of the future will, in the opinion of many authorities, be directed to giving the student the power of reading Latin literature with intelligence and with some appreciation of the finer qualities of the language. Practice in prose composition, which still occupies a large part of the student's attention, will probably be more and more curtailed until it comes to be simply the doing of grammatical exercises, sufficient to give the needful knowledge of the usages of Latin syntax.

My purpose in the present paper is twofold. An endeavour will be made to expound that method of teaching Latin which in my opinion will lead most rapidly and certainly to the end desired, viz., the reading of Latin with intelligent appreciation. At the same time I shall endeavour to show how this method is based upon and throws light on the fundamental facts and laws of human thought and its expression.

Reading with intelligence means that the pupil follows the sense of the passage he is reading, and reads it in such a natural manner that the sense is clearly apprehended by the listener. A pupil may, and often does, read off each single word in the sentence correctly and yet fail to read with intelligence. In what does he come short?

In this—that he has not observed the relationship between the separate words, and does not read them with their proper grouping. For the meaning of a sentence does not flow evenly into our minds, one word after another. Rather it enters, as it has been said, by pulsations—phrase by phrase and clause by clause. Intelligent reading means good word-grouping. When this is achieved, the mind advances from idea to idea by a kind of natural logic in such a manner that the full meaning is realised when the end of the sentence is reached.

Tried by this criterion, very few of our scholars read even easy Latin with intelligence. Even after they know the meaning of a sentence, they approach it as if they were unravelling a tangled skein. And yet to appreciate the form of Latin literature one must read the language as the Romans did—that is, with a clear perception of its peculiar word-grouping.

The study of word-groups—or logical terms, as it is proposed to call them—belongs to the domain of syntax, that part of grammar which treats of the functional relationships of words in a sentence. At the present day the principles of syntax are taught in school mainly under the form of analysis of sentences. It is a valuable exercise for the

cultivation of clear thinking and logical expression for these purposes; but most educationists would agree that there is a good deal of pedantry and formality in connection with it, so that the actual result of the analysis for the pupil is sometimes to darken what it was intended to illuminate.

I go further than this; for I think that the fundamental doctrine of the old analysis—the division of the sentence into subject and predicate—is not wholly correct, and that this analysis is applicable only to one type of sentence, and that not of the greatest importance.

A new analysis of the primitive syntactical conceptions is put forward in this paper. An attempt is made to apply the facts and ideas of the theory of mental development to the theory of syntax, and to exhibit in a concrete and realistic manner the original scheme of syntactical relationships—the primitive categories of the human understanding, as I think they might be called—on which the logic of early speech was based. I hope in this way to recover for our fundamental grammatical ideas some of that original freshness of feeling which has been dulled by the continued use of such abstract and formless terms as *subject*, *indirect object*, *extension of predicate*, *enlargement of subject*, etc.

The analysis of the simple sentence is considered in the first part of the paper, and the complex sentence is briefly dealt with in the second part.

I.—THE SIMPLE SENTENCE.

In analysis the point of attack is all important; and for the student of syntax a consideration of the nature of the verb is the best starting point. The reason is easily given. The verb expresses Action, Doing, Movement; and Action, Doing, Movement are what our bodies are made for, and what, primarily at least, our minds take most interest in. The first intelligent notice the infant takes is directed to the movements and doings of its mother and nurse. In nature's school *Doing it* is the method of instruction employed. She has, therefore, implanted in the child's mind the instinct to observe and to imitate the actions of the persons with whom it lives.

As Action thus claims our first and, indeed, absorbing attention, it follows that the normal type of sentence is that in which an action, generally a human action, is the central idea.

Before proceeding to its analysis, I wish to point out one important result that has followed from this dominant character of the action sentence. Its predominating influence has brought it to pass that all sentences are constructed on its model and a feeling has been engendered that a sentence, if it is to be grammatical, must have a verb, even though it be only the semblance of a verb. This was not originally the case. There were verbless sentences, as, for example, sentences concerning the qualities of a thing. A man tasted a berry and found it good. 'Good berry' was an earlier and more natural way of saying this than 'The berry is good.' In *καλὸς ὁ παῖς* the *ἐστὶ* is not understood, as grammarians assert; it was added in later times. For the substantive use of the verb 'to be' is not primitive. The forms of this verb are no doubt very old, but its present highly abstract meaning must have been evolved comparatively late in the history of speech. The following interesting passage bearing on this point is taken from Professor Earle's *Philology of the English Tongue*:

I one day expressed to an intimate friend my regret that the collectors of vocabularies among savage tribes did not tell us something about the verb 'to be,' and especially I instanced the admirable word-collections of Mr. Wallace. To this conversation I owe the pleasure of being able to quote Mr. Wallace's own observations on this subject in his reply to my friend's query. He says:

'As to such words as "to be," it is impossible to get them in any savage language till you know how to converse in it, or have some intelligent interpreter who can do so. In most of the languages such extremely general words do not exist, and the attempt to get them through an ordinary interpreter would inevitably lead to error. . . . Even in such a comparative high language as the Malay, it is difficult to express "to be" in any of our senses, as the words used would express a number of other things as well, and only serve for "to be" by a roundabout process.'

From Western Australia, where the natives are forming an intermediate speech for communication with our people, and are converting morsels of English to their daily use, we have the following apposite illustrations:—'The words *get down* have been chosen as a synonym for the verb "to be," and the first question of a friendly native would be *Mamman all right get down?* meaning "Is father quite well?"'

The logical copula 'is,' the so-called sign of predication, was evolved later still. A sentence such as 'Man is mortal' does not represent an original type, though grammarians and logicians with their doctrine of subject and predicate often take it as the typical sentence. Predication consists in the mind thinking the ideas *man* and *mortal* together and finding no contradiction in them; it does not lie in the use of 'is,' for 'is' is also used in the question 'Is man mortal?' What purpose then does the insertion of 'is' serve? It simply serves to give a feeling of life and movement and so of greater reality to the sentence.

The doctrine of *subject* and *predicate* makes for clearness of thought in sentences like 'Man is mortal.' But underlying the doctrine is the assumption that every sentence must consist of two parts, one of which—viz., the subject—we know, while the other—the predicate—gives us information concerning the subject. But as we shall see immediately, in most sentences there are not simply two ideas, but often four or five absolutely distinct ideas; and the mind must think all four or five together.

We now begin the work of analysing the simple sentence; but the new analysis promised will turn out to be a very ancient analysis indeed, older than the scientific study of grammar. For the method will be simply to use that ancient and interesting family of words, the interrogative pronouns and adverbs. Taking the action as our central idea, we shall ask: (1) 'Who did it?' (2) 'On whom was it done?' (3) 'For whom was it done?' (4) 'How was it done?' (5) the interrogative of place—'Where?' 'Whence?' 'Whither?' and 'How far?' (6) the interrogatives of time—'When?' and 'How long?'

The answer to these questions, it will be found, cover most of the field of primitive thought.

It will be observed that one important interrogative has been omitted—viz., 'Why?' It will be discussed later on when we come to the complex sentence.

We shall consider the first two questions together—'Who did it?' and 'On whom

was it done?'—subject and object, as they are called: for, being antithetic, they will illustrate one another.

Victor and victim, slayer and slain, eater and eaten, give the primitive ideas of these two grammatical conceptions. In his early struggle for existence on the earth when the larger carnivora were still common, man's energy must have been mainly directed to the two great ends of (1) killing that he might eat and (2) escaping the fate of being eaten. But we shall perceive more clearly the different feelings associated with the ideas of subject and object, if we consider the words for the first personal pronoun when used as subject and object respectively—viz., 'I' and 'me'; for it is from the thoughts and feelings we have of ourselves that we obtain our ideas of the thoughts and feelings of other people. From the thoughts and feelings of ourselves as subject and object, we come by our thoughts of subject and object in general. Contrast, therefore, the words 'I' and 'me.' Though the person referred to is the same, there is so much difference in feeling that we use two different words.

This mysterious sense of *personal agency* is the origin of our conception of the grammatical subject. One objection to this theory will readily suggest itself: 'What of the passive voice? In it the object of the action becomes the subject.' But the history of the passive confirms the theory. For the passive voice was late in development and was impersonal in its origin, and the object of the action remained in the accusative. 'Saxum frangitur' really meant 'Breaking is done on the stone,' *frangitur* being impersonal and *saxum* accusative.

As regards the primitive conception of the object, I believe we shall not be very far from the facts if we picture mentally to ourselves the effect of a heavy blow which, inflicted on a man, would stun him and paralyse his powers of willing and acting; or, if inflicted by him, would reduce the erstwhile active body of his victim to the condition of inert matter. The blow of the civilised man takes the shape of an action at law. And so we find that the Greek name for the object was the 'categoric' case,

the case of the defendant, or, as the Latin grammarians put it, the 'accusative.'

The third question concerning the action was: 'For whom was it done? *Cui bono?*'—the indirect object, as it is called in English grammar. The appellation is unfortunate, but the Latin name is excellent—dative, the person to whom it is given, the recipient. But we shall perhaps best conceive of the indirect object as the *person interested*. Man is more than gregarious; he is social; and his highest social faculty is the faculty of speech. The commonest example of the indirect object is the person spoken to, for to be spoken to is the simplest form of social recognition.

The fourth question concerning the action was: 'How was it done?' This in its most concrete meaning refers to the instrument employed. Man's first instruments were, no doubt, those given him by nature—hands, feet, teeth.

The fifth question deals with the ideas of place and primarily expresses itself in the three interrogatives, *whence*, *where*, and *whither*. The interrogative *how far* comes later. The pre-eminence of the animal lies largely in its power of locomotion. Liberty of movement bulks largely in man's subconscious mind. If he has it, he is free; when it is curtailed, he feels caged and is restless and uneasy. From his power of locomotion spring man's quantitative ideas of space. Just as the idea of device comes mainly through the use of the hand, so the first definite knowledge of the properties of space has been developed through the use of the legs.

The questions with regard to the time of the action—the *when* and *how long* of it—form our sixth category. There is a very intimate connection between our thoughts of time and our thoughts of motion. Perhaps our first idea of abstract time was gathered from the deep-seated feeling of the rhythmic movement of our life. The beating of the heart, with its regular periodic and barely perceptible movement, may be the origin of our idea of the ceaseless, steady passing of time.

From our apprehension of the passing of time, however obtained, we get the ideas of

past, present, and future; and so closely do we associate time and action that the time of the action is always indicated by the form of the verb.

The ordinary definite periods of time, as conceived by primitive mankind, were, no doubt, night and day, evening and morning, the year and its seasons, and his own life with its successive ages of childhood, youth and manhood.

The Indo-Germanic Case System.—We have now completed our study of the fundamental terms of the simple sentence; and an important and interesting fact calls for attention. If the scheme of primitive logical relationships detailed above be examined critically, it will be found to coincide almost exactly with the original Indo-Germanic case system. Thus the Nominative expresses the doer or agent: the Accusative, the person *on whom* the action is done; the Instrumental, the thing *with which* it is done; the Ablative, the place *whence*; the Locative, the place *where*. By an easily felt analogy the Accusative expresses the place *whither* and also the space *how far* (for powers of locomotion overcome the resistance of space and distance). By another intimately-felt analogy, time *when* and time *how long* are expressed by the same cases as the corresponding ideas of space.

One case, it will be observed, has not yet been mentioned—the Genitive. It is adjectival in nature, not adverbial; that is, it expresses association not between a thing and an action but between two things. The English designation for it—Possessive—is a good name, one of the most important associations being that recognised between owner and property.

The Teaching of an Inflected Language.—We are now in a position to apply the results of our analysis to language teaching.

The fundamental question concerning any language is: 'In what manner does it express these primitive logical relationships?'

Latin is an inflected language; and, if the Ablative be treated as a composite case, comprising the Instrument, the True Ablative and the Locative (the two latter being distinguished by the prepositions *ab*, *ex* and *in*), the Latin case system can be made to

correspond completely with the primitive Indo-Germanic.

The difference between inflected Latin and uninflected English will be best exhibited if we endeavour to represent in English the force of the inflections in a Latin sentence.

Here is a typical English sentence :

In the evening, on the bank of the river, the hunter with his arrows killed a stag for his wife and children.

If this were expressed in Latin, the effect of the inflections might be thus represented in English :

Evening the time, the bank of the river the place, hunter the agent, his arrows the instrument, his wife and children the persons interested, stag the object, killed the action.

It will be observed in the first place that in an inflected language the order of the terms is free.

In the second place, the movement of the sentence is slower, but the meaning comes more impressively.

The freedom of the order of the different terms in Latin, and the force of the inflections, are strikingly shown in connection with the adjective. In English the attributive adjective is placed beside the noun it qualifies, as *proud man*, *fair woman*; while in Latin the connection is shown by the adjective having the same inflection as the noun it qualifies—that is to say, the speaker gives the adjective the same attitude—the same logical relationship—to the action. Accordingly it does not require to be placed beside the noun it qualifies; it may be removed from its noun by the whole length of the sentence. It is, in fact, almost substantival. For example, in the sentence given above ('Evening the time,' etc.), the adjectival phrases 'sharp the instrument,' 'fat the object,' might be inserted among the terms in any order we please, and yet it would be evident that 'sharp' goes with 'arrows' in meaning and fat with 'stag.'

In the following two passages the primitive feelings associated with the nominative and accusative cases still survive. Compare the lines

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas
and

Felicem Nioben quamvis tot funera vidit
Quae posuit sensum saxea facta mali.

These are two of those early verbless sentences to which reference has been made. Why is the predicate *felix* in the first and *felicem* in the second? Because *qui potuit* in the first gives the thought of activity, while the mental image of Niobe is that of a victim, motionless and insensible. In the common ejaculation *me miserum* we have a parallel construction to *felicem*, but it will be felt that the meaning of *miserum* harmonises better with the meaning of the accusative, indeed there is something of an oxymoron in *felicem* thus used.

The bearing of these ideas on the teaching of Latin Grammar is easily seen. Of late years there has been an immense improvement in the method of teaching Latin accidence. The doctrine of stem and inflection has firmly established itself. The *anatomy* of the language is now well taught. The next step forward will be to improve the teaching of the *physiology*. The doctrine of the life and use of inflections must be placed on a more scientific basis.

As a commencement to this improvement, two cases should be added to the present case system—viz., the Instrumental and the Locative, which pupils should no longer be allowed to confuse with the Ablative. But, if the views put forward in this paper are correct, their main effect as regards practical teaching should be felt in the actual process of reading Latin. In the language of the professional psychologist, the reader would approach his task with a different 'apprehending mass.' The doctrine of subject and predicate would not be so prominent in his consciousness, but he would instinctively think of one term as telling the *time*, of another as telling the *place*, another the *agent*, and so on to the conclusion of the sentence.

II.—THE COMPLEX SENTENCE.

The two characteristic terms of the complex sentence—the participial phrase and the clause—now demand our attention.

The participial phrase is the more flexible and vivid of the two. The wealth of participial forms in Greek is one of the characteristic beauties of the language. English also has a very effective participle in *-ing*. A group of these participles gives to a sentence what has been called 'a

feeling of radiant activity,' as in the following lines from Walt Whitman—

Splendour of ended day floating and filling me,
Hour prophetic, hour resuming the past.

Latin, on the other hand, is weak as to its participial system. The so-called present participle has only a limited use. The most useful of all the participles, the perfect participle active, is wanting—a great defect in the language. Shift has to be made with the perfect participle passive, and the useful construction known as the Ablative Absolute has been developed. It is, however, but an awkward substitute for an active participle, as will be seen by comparing *Dux, hostibus victis* with *ὁ στρατηγὸς νικήσας τοὺς πολεμίους*.

One common error in grammatical analysis should be noticed here. In analysis of sentences it is the usual custom to take all participial phrases without exception as adjectival and regard them as enlargements of the subject or the object as the case may be. This is not correct, for while a participle may be attributive, it is much more frequently adverbial. Its function is best seen by turning it into a clause. If the clause is adjectival, then the participial phrase is adjectival; but, if the clause is adverbial, so also must be the phrase. This distinction is clearly effected in Greek by the use of the article, as will be seen by comparing *ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ νικήσας* and *ὁ στρατηγὸς νικήσας*.

The weakness of the participial system in Latin gives all the greater importance to the clause. The typical Latin sentence is the long, logically constructed, carefully modulated sentence which is called the period. To the modern mind such a sentence seems complicated; as Jowett has said, 'Modern languages have rubbed off this adversative and inferential form; they have fewer links of connexion, there is less mortar in the interstices; and they are content to place sentences side by side, leaving their relation to one another to be gathered from their position or from the context.'

To follow the meaning of the Latin period, it is of the first importance to understand the nature of the clause; and it will be useful to cite the parallel of the algebraic bracket. A clause is something

enclosed. Just as in the bracket the curved lines enclosing the terms attract the eye of the student, so in the clause the words that mark the beginning and end are of special importance. The introductory word is generally of pronominal origin, is easily recognisable, and indicates the nature of the clause. The word marking the conclusion is the verb, and in many cases it is put in the subjunctive, so that in the popular consciousness the subjunctive mood, as its name indicates, came to be regarded as the mood of the subordinate clause.

The observation should also be made that, as in algebra one may have brackets within brackets, so a clause may, and often does, contain among its terms subordinate clauses and phrases.

Only the briefest survey is possible here of the various types of clause. They fall into three classes—adjectival, substantival and adverbial.

Adjectival clauses are simple and do not call for any remark.

Substantival clauses consist of reported questions, statements and commands. It is not necessary to say more here on these clauses than that a long narrative can be told clearly in the *oratio obliqua* in Latin, its reported character being in evidence all the time. This is a considerable achievement. The following extract from an Ulster narrative will illustrate some of the difficulties of the man who wrestles with the problem of indirect speech in an uninflected language:

Ses I to him, ses I, 'That coo o' yours,' ses I, 'she'll no be verra contint the night,' I ses to him—like that, d'ye mind?

'Och,' ses he, 'the coo's all right,' ses he, he ses to me. 'All right,' ses I, 'all right: but,' ses I, 'I don't think,' ses I, 'as she's pertickler comfortable,' ses I; 'I wudn't say she was,' ses I. 'Don't bother yerself,' ses he, he ses; 'the coo's strange; that's all,' ses he.

'She's strange,' ses I, 'av coorse; but,' ses I, I ses, 'I wudn't call it comfortable,' ses I, 'hingin wi' a broken leg between two powls,' ses I, just that way, d'ye mind?

Adverbial clauses are by far the most important, and are of many types. But a general survey of the adverbial clause, sufficient for our purpose, will be effected if we consider that the principles on which actions and events are associated in our minds must

follow the great laws of the Association of Ideas. Hume, one of the great exponents of these laws, classified them under three headings—contiguity, similarity, and cause and effect.

Contiguity is not of great importance in this connection. It gives us clauses of *place* and *time*.

Similarity gives us the important clauses of *manner* and *comparison*.

But the idea of cause and effect is of predominating importance, as nothing produces a stronger feeling of connection in the human mind than the perception of this logical relationship. Under this heading would be classified all the numerous *Cum Causale* clauses, which give the precedent circumstances from which the main action springs, and the equally numerous *Ut* clauses of purpose and consequence which give the subsequent actions that arise or are intended to arise out of the main action. Under this heading also fall all the *Si* clauses which represent the idea of cause and effect in its most highly developed form—that of condition.

It may be remarked that Hume's threefold division does not quite cover all the ground; e.g. clauses of concession find no place under any one of his three headings.

We are now in a position to apply our principles to the reading of an elaborately constructed sentence, such as a Ciceronian period. It will help us if we realise that these long sentences, which seem so complicated to the average student, must as a matter of fact have not been so difficult to follow. This can be readily shown. Many of Cicero's most celebrated speeches were addressed to political meetings in the Forum, and were delivered to large miscellaneous audiences. Now, the orator who addresses such meetings must at all costs be clear. People will not give a patient hearing to a man whom they cannot understand. It may be assumed, therefore, that his hearers followed Cicero's rounded periods without any consciousness of the difficulty of their structure. How did they do this? There was but one possible method. The hearer's thought advanced from idea to idea as expressed in the successive terms, each idea persisting in his consciousness more or less

distinctly, according to its emphasis, on to the conclusion of the sentence, on reaching which the completed meaning of the whole sentence presented itself to his mind.

The student's success in attaining a similar facility in *reading* will depend on his ability to recognise promptly and accurately the word-grouping of the sentence. He will find that the framework of the sentence lends him assistance. The word-groups, whether clauses or participial phrases or simple terms, are distinctly marked and are logically connected. When the earlier portion of the sentence has been intelligently read, the reader will often be able to anticipate the form of what is going to follow. An adjective suggests a noun. An adverb of degree or manner, such as *ita* or *sic*, makes him look forward to a clause of consequence. A verb of petitioning or ordering calls for an indirect command. A *non modo* ushering in one term must be followed by a *sed etiam* introducing a similar term. The grammatical scheme of the sentence will reveal itself to him as he reads.

The following is a good specimen of a Latin period from Livy, although, judged according to modern ideas, an excessive amount of matter has been compressed into it:

Ibi cum Herculem, cibo vinoque gravatum, sopor oppressisset, pastor accola eius loci, nomine Cacus, ferox viribus, captus pulchritudine bouum, cum avertere eam praedam vellet, quia, si agendo armentum in speluncam compulisset, ipsa vestigia quaerentem dominum eo deductura erant, aversos boves, eximium quemque pulchritudine, caudis in speluncam traxit.

In conclusion the following suggestion is put forward for the improvement of the class-teaching of Latin. Under the guidance of the teacher the class should frequently practise reading the lesson aloud simultaneously, pausing at the end of each term so that they may gather the meaning as they read, and dispensing as far as may be with translation. In this reading the teacher should endeavour to cover as much ground as possible. For it is only by extensive reading that the pupils will become familiar enough with the general scheme of a Latin sentence to recognise its structure at sight.

W. A. RUSSELL, M.A.,
Inspector of High Schools, Cape Colony.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF ALCAEUS.

THE following restoration of part of one of the new fragments of Alcaeus¹ is based on a photograph of the papyrus kindly supplied to me by Dr. W. Schubart. At first sight it would seem a well-nigh hopeless task to restore so mutilated a fragment with any degree of probability. But there is really a good deal to help us. Not only have we the metre and the dialect to guide us, and the general test of literary and linguistic suitability, but there is what in similar cases has been too often disregarded, the necessity of making all the suggested beginnings of the lines correspond in written length. Given these conditions, it is surprising how few alternatives are possible. In the present case the restorations are all based on careful tracing from extant parts of the MS, and the beginnings of the lines coincide with a vertical line drawn parallel to the fibre of the papyrus.

The poem explains itself. The scene is a chamber opening on a harbour, and the time is early in the forenoon of a hot summer's day. Alcaeus, roused to energy by the cool morning air, urges a less active companion to make a speedy end of the breakfast-drinking and come for a sail. They have only, he says, to go aboard their boat, set sail, and cast off; and they will spend a far jollier day, in fact (here the wine-bibber is betrayed by his metaphor) it will be as good fun as a long draught of wine. To add force to his appeal, he gives the lazy friend a picture of himself, lolling back on the couch with hands folded, refusing to budge. Let Alcaeus, the poet pretends him to say, speak for himself; as for him, he will call for unguent and spend a hot day in repose, unperturbed by the other's bluster.

TEXT.

.....]τε καθάγη
.....]is δόμοις
.....]αν
.....]έκεσθαι
5]εν οὐ ζῆται
.....]ωμένω

¹First published in 1907 in *Berliner Klassiker-texte*, Heft V 2, P. 9810, by W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.

.....]επει
.....]σης.
μὴ πλεῖν ἀρύστηρ' ἐς κέραμεν μέγαν
10 τί τόσσον]α μόχθης, τοῦτ' ἔμεθεν σύνεις,
ὡς οὐ τι] μὴ τῷξ αἶσος ἄλλως
ἄμμαρ ἔμοι μεθύων αἰέσης;
τί γὰρ θα]λάσσης φειδόμεθ', ὡς κάρων
χειμῶ]νοειδὴν αἶθρον ἐπήμειοι;
15 αἱ δ' ἐν]τάθεντες ὡς τάχιστα
κάπριγ]ᾶδαν καμάκων ἔλοντες
ἅπ νᾶα] λίσσμεν προτ' ἐνώπια
κέρα τρο]ποντες, καὶ κ' ἰθαρώτεροι
φνίγμ]εν ἱλλάεντι θύμωι
20 ἀντὶ δ'] ἀμύστιδος ὄργον εἴη.
φαῖς δ' ὄρ]γον ἄρταις χέρρα σὺν Φεμμάτων
ὑπερθε χέρρι: "Ε]μωι φ[ερέ]τω κάραι
μύρραν τις· οὐ γὰρ] εἰστίθῃσιν
Φάδμεν' ἔμοιγ' ὅδε ταῦδ' αἰδοῖαι.
25 οὐ μὲν] ταρασσῇ,] ἀγρι' αὐτὰ, μοι
ψύχαν, ὃ γε βρύχων] ἄτε πῦρ μέγα
..... τίθησθα
.....

CRITICAL NOTES.

All the lines began directly under one another, the stanzas being prob. marked by the paragraphos 9 Pap. prob. πλεῖν 10 α is probable before μόχθεις (sic) 11 Pap. τῷξ not τῷξ: the 'μέση στιγμῇ' after ἄλλως in the Pap. Dr. Schubart kindly tells me may be an accidental blot like others near it, especially as there are no stops elsewhere,¹ and moreover the μέση is rare in MSS of this date 13 Pap. φειδομεθώς: Pap. κήρον, which is unmetrical: W. κῆρον, comparing l. 1, which he reads τεκαιθακη, but that need not be θᾶκη 16 Pap. prob. καιπριγαδαν 18 ἰθαρώτεροι, W. compares Hesych. 19 ἱλλάεντι, S. = ἱλάεντι = ἱλαρῶι: Pap. θυμωι indistinct but almost certain, see on 22 20 Pap. εργον 21 Pap. prob. αργον, but the letter before ο may be τ: Pap. μεμμάτων, cf. Sa. 2. 13 α δὲ Φιδρως κακχέεται where MSS read μ' ἰδρως; similarly in Sa. 2. 1 φαίνεται Φοι (i.e. ἐαυτῶν) κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν may be right despite Catullus, for Apollonius Dysc. *de Pron.*

¹Unless in l. 27; and if that is a μέση, this must be accidental.

336 A quotes from Sappho the words φαίνεται
 Φοι κῆνος,¹ and in fr. 89 *Fe* = ἐάντην, cf. also
 fr. 117² 22 below γοναῖ in the line
 above there are very small remains of the
 tops of letters which may be ρριε, below αἰ
 a curved stroke which I take to be the left-
 hand half of μ, and below χ a small piece
 of the right-hand curve of ω; the last down-
 stroke of the μ was shortened before the ω,
 and there was no break between the two
 letters; the same must have been the case
 in θυμῷ l. 19: in φερετω ερε fits the gap, and
 τ though indistinct is certain: Pap. καραι
 24 Pap. prob. γαδμενον φαδμεν Meist. Ahr. p. 105,
 or else one of the elided vowels was written:
 in δ]δε, δ is almost certain: Pap. ταιδαιδα
 Between ll. 25 and 26 a space, but not
 sufficient to contain another line, prob. to
 avoid a spongy spot 26 Pap. αττε, which
 is unmetrical 27 Pap. after τιθησθα a
 very short horizontal dash just above the line
 28 there are marks which may be very faint
 traces of this line.

(On the right, opposite ll. 1-3, traces of
 another column, with a > opposite ll. 3
 and 4.)

TRANSLATION.

Mix no more into the great bowl; why
 labourst so, when I tell thee that never will
 I have thee to waste the day from dawn
 onward in drunkenness and song? O why
 spare we to use the sea, suffering the winter-
 cool freshness of the morn to pass like a
 drunken sleep? If we would but go quickly
 aboard, take the rudders in our grasp, and
 loose the ship from her moorings, turning
 the sailyard to front the breeze, then merrier
 should we be and light of heart, and 't would
 be as good work as a right long draught of
 wine. But thou, linking one idle hand in
 another over thy robe, sayest 'As for me,
 bring they myrrh for my head; for I am
 little pleased with that this fellow putteth
 into this song of his. Never think thou
 troublest my soul, thou wild clamourer,
 though thou roarest like a great fire and
 makest'

¹ But 335 A the first one and a half lines of the Ode
 with μοι.

² Bergk⁴.

COMMENTARY.

It will be seen that the whole of my res-
 toration depends on the interpretation of
 τωξανος. (1) If αῖος is the genitive of the
 word for 'dawn,' it has no parallel elsewhere
 in Lesbian; but on the other hand there is
 no genitive of the word extant in that dialect
 till quite late times. Apollonius Dysc. *de*
Adv. p. 183 l. 21 (Schneider) mentions
 among μεταπλασμοί, the word αῖα as used
 by Sappho. I take αῖα to be an accusative,
 representing an earlier ἄΦοα or αῖοα the
 probable original of Ἡὼ διαν, *Il.* 9. 240 et
 al. Of the corresponding genitive we get a
 glimpse in Pindar *Nem.* 6. 52, where the
 MSS read δαῖος but the metre requires δαός.
 If Sappho used αῖα for the accusative,
 Alcaeus might have used αῖος for the
 genitive. (2) An alternative is to take ἔξανος
 as the neuter of an adjective ἔξαιος mean-
 ing ὁ ἐξ ἔω, cf. ἔξηβος, ἔξωρος.

9 πλεῦν: this form, classed as Ionic and
 Doric, was probably also Lesbian (some read
 πνεῦν Pind. *P.* 4. 225); cf. βέλεις (gen.) Alc.
 15. 4, ὄρχευντ' Sa. 54. 2, and the forms
 Θεῖδαμος and Θενδαίτης on coins, v. Meister-
 Ahrens i. p. 98.

κέραμεν: infinitive of κέραμι used as
 imperative; elsewhere the Lesbian form is
 κέρναν, but Alcaeus and Sappho sometimes
 use Homeric forms for metrical reasons; cf.
 Sa. 78, 1 and 2 for infin. as imp. and for an
 Homeric form.

10 μόχθης: from μόχθημι; μόχθησθα
 would be used if the metre required it.

11 οὐ τι μὴ . . . αἰείσης: an early use of
 this construction, but not necessarily to be
 rejected; it is used by Simonides fr. 12. 19
 (Hiller); αἰείσης may be future or subjunctive,
 cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. pp. 89, 93, note 2.

12 ἄμμαρ: i.e. ἦμαρ; for the μμ cf. one
 of the new fragments of Sappho, *Berl.*
Klassikertexte V 2, P. 9722. 2. 2., l. 17
 πεπονημένας, where it would seem to have as
 little right as here; cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. § 34.

13 κάρων: elsewhere the form is κάρως,
 neuter; for Lesbian peculiarities of declen-
 sion cf. αἶδως for αἰδῶς Sa. 1. 6, κίνδυν or
 κίνδυννα for κίνδυνον fr. 161, ἔπος for ἔπως
 passim, Alc. ἄγωνος for ἀγών fr. 121, and the
 use of -ην as acc. sing. of adjectives in -ης,
 as in χερμωνοειδην below.

14 ἐπήμενοι: i.e. ἐφειμένοι, lit. 'having let go,' 'allowed to pass'; for η cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 93 note 2.

16 κἀπριγάδαν: i.e. καὶ ἄπριγδα (Aesch. *Pers.* 1057); for the form cf. κρυφάδαν, λαθράδαν for κρύβδα, λάθρα in Boeotian, Corinna *Hel.* 14, *Asop.* 59, *Berl. Klassiker-texte*; or κἀπριχάδαν? This word seems unnecessarily strong. An alternative would be τάν τε χάδαν 'and the tiller,' χαδή bearing the same relation to χαρνάνω as λαβή to λαμβάνω; but the article is perhaps unlikely. For the singular χάδαν with the plural καμάκων cf. Luc. *Nav.* 5 ἐπὶ λεπτῇ κάμακι τὰ τηλικαῦτα πηδάλια περιστρέφων.

17 λίσσμεν: I take this to be subjunctive, cf. ἔρᾱται Sa. fr. 13, Pind. *P.* 4. 92, and δύνᾱμαι Sa. (*Berl. Klass. texte*, P. 5006). ἔσταμεν Alc. 15. 7 looks like a subjunctive. For αἰ with subjunctive without κέν see on l. 18, and Goodwin *M. and T.* § 453-4.

πρὸτ': if this is a genuine Aeolic form it supports the suggested πρὸτι in Theocr. 30. 24 where the MSS have the unmetrical ποτί.

πρὸτ' ἐνώπια: cf. ἐνώπιον Theocr. 22. 152; lit. 'to face' the wind, i.e. so as to catch it.

18 κέρα: the ends of the sailyard, to which the ropes for regulating the position of the sail would be fastened.

τρόποντες: Present, cf. στρόφω Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 52; so also ἐπιτρόπηις Theocr. 29. 35, which however is generally taken as Aorist.

καὶ κ': marks the apodosis in a similar conditional sentence in another fragment of Alcaeus, Hiller *Anth. Lyr.* 42a,

αἰ δὴ μὰν χέραδος μὴ βεβάω Φεργάσιμον
λίθον

κίνηις, καὶ κέν ἴσως τὰν κεφάλαν ἀργαλίαν
ἔχουσ.

It marks a secondary apodosis Pind. *P.* 3. 68.

19 φνύμεν: 2nd Aorist Optative, cf. φύη Theocr. 15. 94; Aeolic would keep the υ, especially as the Present would be φνίω for φύνω, cf. Kühner, *G.G.* 1. 2. p. 567. For αἰ

κε with subjunctive followed by Optative cf. fr. 83.

20 ἀντί: 'as good as,' cf. *Il.* 9. 116 ἀντί πολλῶν λαῶν ἐστί and other instances in L. and S.

ὄργον: this form of ἔργον is rendered probable by ὄρπετον for ἔρπετον Sa. fr. 40; cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 52.

21 φαῖς: i.e. φής.

ὄργον: i.e. ἄφοργον.

ἄρταις: Present Participle of ἄρταιμι.

22 χέρρι ἔμωι: cf. κῶπτι ἔμωι Sa. 1. 17.

23 μύρραν: used by Sappho for σμύρναν according to Athen. 688 c.

τις: cf. fr. 36.

25 παράσσης: for παράσσεις, see on 11.

26 ὃ γέ: relative.

One or two of the above suggestions involve 'new' words or forms. These I feel to be peculiarly hazardous. But in attempting to transform a specimen of palaeography into a piece of literature one should not be altogether debarred from such guesses. It would be absurd to suppose that in the two or three hundred lines which we possess of Lesbian literature the vocabularies of Sappho and Alcaeus are exhausted. The first ten lines of the first of the new Paeans of Pindar contain two words not found elsewhere, a third found only in Aristides, and a fourth only in Hesychius. There are upwards of 4000 lines of Pindar extant.

[Since the above was set up in type my attention has been directed to the suggestions made by Mr. Powell on p. 177 of the *C.R.* Though my restoration is based upon a different conception of the scene described, it may be well to give the result of my tracing-test as applied to his suggestions. I use the signs +, -, or = to indicate that his first letter falls beyond, within, or upon my *terminus ad quem*. 13 τί δ' οὐ (with W.) = 14 χιόνειδην - 15 ἔρετμὰ θέντες impossible, the letter before α must be γ or τ 16 παρβολάδαν = 17 ἔπειτα = 18 πλοίου τρέποντες + 19 πίνοιμεν = 20 τοῦτο κ' +.]

J. M. EDMONDS.

A NEW READING OF THE *HIPPOLYTUS*.

THE *Hippolytus* is generally ranked as one of the finest, if not the finest, of Euripides' plays; standing on its own merits as an early but excellent example of Romantic drama, it has recently obtained a considerable success on the stage at Manchester, where those who saw it played, many of whom were ignorant of Greek and quite free from that prejudice in favour of classical form which may be thought to warp the scholar's judgment, were deeply impressed by its dramatic power.

The motives of the play are so complex that after reading it or seeing it acted we are left in total bewilderment as to where the blame of the tragedy really lies, or rather, how it should be apportioned. Yet no critic hitherto has discovered that there is a riddle underlying it, or seen any trace of a teaching, intelligible only to the initiated, different from that lesson which seems to be enforced—that those who disobey the world's moral laws must be the cause of misery and ruin to themselves and others. But, as the lightning strikes the mountain-summits, it is probable that, sooner or later, modern critics will fall upon this masterpiece, and we may perhaps forestall them by pointing out some of the inconsistencies of the play.

First, however, we must say what we can on behalf of the author who is on trial. According to tradition, the *Hippolytus* in its extant form is the second play by our poet on the same subject, or rather, perhaps a revision of the original form. From the fragments of the older play,¹ we are led to believe that Phaedra herself accused Hippolytus to Theseus, and it is generally supposed that she was there represented as declaring her passion to Hippolytus in person.²

With the story in this form, there could be little to raise Phaedra above the level of Sthenoboea, with whom she is ranked by Aristophanes.³ As the slighted Antea cried in anger to Proetus, demanding the death of Bellerophon, so in all probability Phaedra acted according to epic tradition. The in-

troduction of the nurse and the story of the δέλτος may well be refinements devised by Euripides himself; and after reading the first half of the play no one can fail to realize how vastly Euripides has improved on the familiar story of the gross type.

The character of Phaedra, as conceived by Euripides, explains her reasons for suicide. She loves passionately, but when her love, declared against her will, is slighted, the shame of outraged pride is the dominant motive. She is shamed and enraged not so much by the coldness of Hippolytus as by the false and undignified position in which the nurse's officiousness has placed her. The evil inclinations against which she has been struggling are, when revealed, as sinful to her mind as the deed of evil would have been. Remorse prompts her to kill herself, for she will not bring shame on her royal lineage, nor face Theseus with the consciousness of guilt, for the sake of saving one life.⁴

To what life is she referring? If it were not for the sequel, we should say that she means her own, for suicide is the thought uppermost in her mind. We have had, so far, little indication of her love having suddenly changed into hate so violent that she is eager to sacrifice the beloved. She may wish to wring his bosom, to move him at last to pity, if not to a tenderer feeling, by the contemplation of her own violent end; but we can hardly yet believe that she wishes to bring him to a cruel death. Indeed her first utterance after listening to his reproaches is ἐτύχομεν δίκας⁵—'we have met with justice.' So her subsequent treachery shocks us the more as it is unexpected.

Again, let us consider the stage-situation. Theseus is abroad; Hippolytus has announced his intention of leaving the palace until his father returns; and Phaedra believes that he will then break his oath and tell Theseus all. If Hippolytus is likely to break his oath, the Chorus may well break theirs, and such a weight of evidence will overpower any accusation on her part, especially as Hippolytus

¹ *Poetae Scenici* (Dindorf), 442, 443.

² See *Intro.* to Mahaffy and Bury's Edn.

³ *Frogs*, 1043.

⁴ *Hippolytus*, 719-722.

⁵ *Hipp.* 672.

will have told his story first. Moreover, there is little chance of any such message as she actually leaves behind her reaching Theseus. He, as already noted, is abroad; Hippolytus is near at hand, and the news of the Queen's death, cried through all Attica, must bring him soon on the spot, when, seeking for an explanation of her death, he would discover this damaging piece of false evidence and destroy it.

We may now consider the possibility of another theory. Phaedra declares her intention of causing trouble (evil) to another 'that he may learn not to regard my evils proudly';¹ in other words, she will die, and let him know that he caused her death.

There is no anticipation that Theseus' return is imminent; unexpectedly he arrives before his son, and reads the tablet intended for Hippolytus, inscribed, let us suppose, with some such words as 'Thy love has destroyed me'—he draws the natural inference, and a tragedy still more grim than that of the Queen's death is the result of this misunderstanding. Had the δέλτος with the message so worded fallen into the hands of Hippolytus, his chivalrous pity for the dead would have sealed his lips, and the Chorus could be trusted to remain silent so long as no danger threatened the beloved young hero; that the oaths would be so binding even in the new circumstances of horror could never have been foreseen by Phaedra—indeed she had emphatically repudiated the idea that Hippolytus would keep his oath even when in no danger whatsoever.² Still less could she have believed that he would remain silent, as he actually did, when the terror of death confronted him.

The death of Hippolytus is thus due to a series of accidents, which Phaedra could never have foreseen or reckoned on.

On these lines a consistent explanation of the play could be constructed, which a critic of exceptional merit might even make plausible.

¹ *Hipp.* 728-731. Surely the νόσος in which Hippolytus is to share, and so 'learn to be temperate,' is here *love*, not *death*; cf. *infra* 765, Ἀφροδίτας νόσος.

² *Hipp.* 689-690.

On the above suppositions we have introduced an example of one of the important axioms of modern criticism—that the gods of Euripides shall be futile. As in other plays, the prologue will have no real bearing on the plot. Dr. Verrall has pointed to other plays (e.g. the *Alkestis*) where the god prologizing predicts events which never really happen.³ Here Euripides is even more subtle, for everything turns out exactly as Cypris wishes, but the events are due actually not to her intervention but to an extraordinary set of malign chances. If Theseus had not returned before he was due; if he had not misinterpreted the message; if Hippolytus and the Chorus had not been pious beyond all rational expectation, Cypris would have been completely stultified; as it is, Ἀνάγκη, that blind force which is older and stronger than any personal divinity, is alone responsible for the catastrophe. It may be further observed that Artemis at the close of the play gives a circumstantial account of the events, tallying exactly with the ordinary reading of the plot; but if we accept the modern canon that a *deus ex machina* is either ineffectual or mendacious,⁴ we have scored an additional point.

Most old-fashioned lovers of Euripides, however, will be content with the *prima facie* plot; they will find that it is equally tragic, and, while making less of a tax on their credulity, presents a more subtle psychological problem. As to Phaedra's irrational action, 'odi et amo' is a commonplace in such stories, and the knowledge of an infuriated woman's capabilities may well, they will say, be left to the so-called misogynist poet.

J. F. DOBSON.

The University, Manchester.

³ Cf. *Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 160. '... the story is contained solely in the action proper, without the prologue and finale, which are not the story but comments on the story by "gods," that is to say "liars."'

⁴ *Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 67. 'Experienced readers at Athens must have known that in Euripides what had been spoken from the machine was not to be taken seriously. . . .'

LAST WORDS ON PORTUS ITIUS.

I HAVE something to say about Portus Itius which has never been said before; and I ask all who have read my two former articles to read to the end before they decide, considering the arguments without prejudice and reserving judgement on the writer's shortcomings.

A few days before the publication of *Ancient Britain*, when all the sheets had been printed, I saw that there were flaws in the article on Portus Itius which formed a part of that volume. While I was revising it I felt the need of trustworthy and detailed information regarding the experiments that were made in order to ascertain the time in which the main division of Napoleon's flotilla could clear the port of Boulogne; but I failed until too late to put my hands upon the authoritative work—Captain E. Desbrière's *Projets et tentatives de débarquement aux îles britanniques*—in which it is contained. Serious reviewers, British, American, and Continental, who had already devoted much time to the study of Caesar's British expeditions, have pronounced that the conclusion reached in the article which deals with the question of his landing-place is definitively established;¹ but two scholars who were convinced, and one of whom was converted, by the argument have told me that the article on Portus Itius did not seem to them to achieve demonstration; and Mr. Stuart Jones in the *English Historical Review* has recently written in the same sense.

It will not, however, be denied by any critic who has even an elementary knowledge of seamanship or is willing to accept the unanimous testimony of nautical experts that the article made one contribution to knowledge: it proved that the port from which Caesar sailed in his first expedition was Boulogne.² It is now generally admitted

¹ Among many others Mr. A. G. Peskett (*Class. Rev.* xxii. 1908, p. 94), Prof. Dennison (*Class. Philology*, iii. 1908, p. 457), M. Camille Jullian (*Rev. des études anc.* x. 1908, p. 290), and Mr. H. Stuart Jones (*Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxiv. 1909, pp. 115-6).

² *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar*, pp. 581-3. I am glad to find that Mr.

that Portus Itius was either Boulogne or Wissant. If, then, Caesar sailed from the same port on both his expeditions, Portus Itius was Boulogne. The difficulty is that he did not say that on his first expedition he started from Portus Itius; and while I was at work upon the article I felt 'obstinate questionings' in regard to his having only mentioned the harbour in connexion with the second expedition. The drift of my argument was that Boulogne was in all respects more convenient as a starting-point than Wissant, and that Caesar, having had experience of the superior advantages of Boulogne in 55 B.C., would not have abandoned it in the following year. But, for want of the information which I found too late, I failed to see that Boulogne, with all its superior advantages, had, for the second expedition, one drawback which may have been damning.

I will now point out the flaws in my article that may have escaped the notice of reviewers, and ask scholars to consider that one aspect of the question—the most important of all—which has hitherto been neglected.

On page 569³ I asked 'if eight hundred ships had been beached at Wissant [during the twenty-five days for which Caesar was windbound at Portus Itius in 54 B.C.], would it not have been necessary, in order to protect them from storm-driven spring tides, to construct an enormous naval camp, the earth necessary for which did not exist?' I asked the question because, as I have shown on pages 566-7, there was no harbour, properly so called, at Wissant except a creek formed by the mouth of the rivulet called the Rieu d'Herlan, and possibly a small anchorage partially sheltered by a shoal. The answer is that to construct a naval camp would not have been necessary if the ships could be hauled up beyond the highest high-water mark of spring tides. Supposing that the dune which extends from the Stuart Jones (*Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxiv. 1909, p. 115), with many other competent critics, accepts this conclusion.

³ See also p. 574.

'ruisseau de Guiptun,' near Tardingham, to the 'ruisseau d'Herlan,' at Wissant, and which did not exist in the time of Caesar,¹ were bodily removed, it would not, I think, be possible now to haul up ships beyond this mark; but if we may suppose that the subsidence which has taken place since Roman times between Sangatte and Dunkirk extended to Wissant, there must in 54 B.C. have been a fringe of beach immediately below the high ground wide enough to allow eight hundred ships to remain high and dry at all states of the tide.²

On page 571, note 2, I hardly allowed sufficient weight to the fact that the author of *Bellum Africanum* (10, § 1) applies the name of *portus* to a mere anchorage,—that of Monastir (the ancient Ruspina), which is protected from northerly and westerly winds, but otherwise exposed.³

On page 584 I argued, as Desjardins had done before, that the sixty ships which Labienus built during Caesar's absence in Britain could not have been built at Wissant, where there were certainly no dockyards and whither it would have been very difficult to convey the necessary timber; whereas the material could have been carried both by road and river to Boulogne. But I overlooked a passage in Caesar (v. 8, § 1) to which I had on an earlier page called attention. He tells us that he directed Labienus 'to protect the ports' (*ut portus tueretur*), which implies that he thought it

necessary to keep more than one port under control. Assuming then that *Portus Itius* was Wissant, the ships were doubtless built at Boulogne.

On page 585 I showed that, according to 'seafaring men, both English and French, who have practical experience of the winds and the currents in the Channel,' 'the passage for sailing-vessels from Boulogne to the south-eastern part of Britain is, and always has been, in circumstances such as Caesar described, not only very convenient but by far the most convenient.' But Caesar had to think of the start and of the arrival as well as of the passage; and this consideration brings me to the question on which the whole controversy really turns,—could Caesar's fleet have started from Boulogne without becoming unduly scattered?

It must of course be remembered that the port of Boulogne in the time of Napoleon was less spacious and less deep than it was 2000 years ago because it had been largely silted up.⁴ Still, although the map in which Desjardins⁵ attempts to depict the state of the Liane in Caesar's time and represents it as navigable for sea-going ships as far as Isques—7 kilometres from the mouth—seems approximately correct, it is of course in part conjectural. Moreover, although we know that Boulogne was from the time of Augustus the regular starting-point for ships sailing from North-eastern Gaul to Britain and the naval station of the Roman Channel Fleet, we have no information as to the largest number of ships which ever started from it at one time. There is not even direct evidence that Aulus Plautius sailed from Boulogne:⁶ if he did, some of his ships may have sailed from Ambleteuse; and we do not know how many he had. All we know

¹ *Ancient Britain*, etc., p. 566.

² The eminent geologist, M. Charles Barrois, of the University of Lille, has very kindly written to me on this question. 'Je ne crois pas,' he says, 'que nous ayons encore des documents assez précis pour arriver à une connaissance décisive et absolue de la question topographique qui vous intéresse. Il faudrait pour cela faire une série de levées topographiques et de nivellements précis qui n'ont pu être faits encore.'

'Je ne puis donc vous donner que mon impression que les conclusions de M. Gosselet [that the coast between Sangatte and Dunkirk extended considerably further seaward in Roman times than now (*Ancient Britain*, p. 566)] me paraissent appuyées sur des bases solides, qui n'ont pas été réfutées, et doivent entraîner l'assentiment, la côte s'étendant plus loin à l'époque romaine. . . . Je n'ai rien à ajouter à vos connaissances bibliographiques, qui me paraissent fort complètes.'

³ Cf. Stöfel, *Hist. de Jules César, — Guerre civile*, ii. 110-1, and pl. 20.

⁴ *Ancient Britain*, etc., pp. 586-7. Cf. *Boulogne-sur-mer et la région boulonnaise*, i. 1899, p. 31.

⁵ *Géogr. de la Gaule rom.* i. 1876, pl. xv.

⁶ Mr. H. G. Evelyn-White (*Class. Rev.* xxii. 1908, p. 205, n. 9) thinks that it 'can probably be inferred [that Plautius started from Boulogne] from Suetonius, v. 17,'—*Quare a Massilia Gesoriacum usque pedestri itinere confecto inde [Claudius] transmisit*, etc. But Claudius was not accompanied by an army; and it is questionable whether he would have started from Boulogne if he had had to get 800 ships out of the harbour.

is that Caesar sailed from Boulogne in 55 B.C. with about 80 transports and a few galleys; and it is probable that even this comparatively small fleet was inconveniently strung out.¹ Philip Augustus is said to have assembled 1500 ships at Boulogne in 1213 for his contemplated invasion of England;² but the attempt was abandoned.

Captain Desbrière's researches have shown that one of the insuperable difficulties with which Napoleon had to contend was this:—it was impossible, in the most favourable circumstances, to float more than 100 vessels out of Boulogne harbour in one tide;³ and therefore it would have been necessary for each successive relay of ships to anchor in the roadstead until the whole flotilla had cleared the harbour. But experience proved that it was dangerous to keep more ships in the roadstead than would be able, in case an unfavourable wind sprang up, to return for shelter into the estuary; and that westerly and south-westerly winds, which were favourable for the voyage, generally made the roadstead unsafe.⁴ Owing to the rapidity of the current vessels could not safely begin to move out of the port until half-an-hour before high tide; and even those which were rowed could not continue the operation later than two hours after the tide began to fall, and then only if the wind was not against them.⁵

My point then is this. Although we know that the estuary of the Liane was larger and deeper in Caesar's time than in Napoleon's,

we cannot be sure that Caesar would have been able to get eight times as many ships out of it in one tide as Napoleon;⁶ and we know that even if he could have done so, they would have been obliged to anchor in the roadstead as they emerged until the whole flotilla had cleared the harbour. For, in the most favourable circumstances, and assuming that the harbour was as extensive and as deep as Desjardins maintained, this operation would have required not much less than ten hours:⁷ if the ships had sailed on as they emerged from the estuary, the leading division would have been off the British coast at daybreak⁸ before the rearmost had begun their voyage; and it is clear from Caesar's words that the start was virtually simultaneous.⁹ But there is another point to mark. I have said that the ships, as they came out of the harbour, would have been obliged to anchor in the roadstead. But it is extremely doubtful whether they would have anchored in the open roadstead. Probably they would have been attached by hawsers to the shore, and anchored as well. For Caesar describes his start by the words *naves solvit*.¹⁰ Now, as Professor J. S. Reid has written to me, 'the natural meaning of the expression [*navem solvere*] is . . . to free the ship from all her fastenings'; and it commonly connotes the operation of un-mooring,—letting go a hawser and putting off from shore or quay. Perhaps, if the ships were merely riding at anchor, the expression might, as Professor Reid admits, 'be loosely

¹ Cf. *B.G.* iv. 23, § 2 with § 4.

² M. Luchaire (*E. Lavisse, Hist. de France*, t. iii. 1re partie, 1901, p. 162) appears sceptical as to the number.

³ *Projets et tentatives*, etc. iii. 1902, pp. 451, 566.

⁴ *Ib.* iv. 91, 94–5; iii. 141. Between the 1st of May and the 1st of November, 1804, more than 150 vessels were on three several occasions anchored in the roadstead for six or seven successive days; but on each occasion, when they were returning into the harbour, some of them were dispersed or injured (*ib.* iv. 145). Except in the very narrow space formed by the channel of the Liane, which at low water nowhere exceeded 40 metres in breadth and was in many places not more than 20, the ships were generally aground (*ib.* iii. pp. 147–8). The vessels of least draught could only cross the bar even at spring tides during 4 hours.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 144.

⁶ Some years ago I put the following question to Capt. J. Iron, the harbour-master of Dover:—'It is certain that Boulogne harbour, that is, the estuary of the river Liane, was much larger in 54 B.C. than it is now. Assume that the harbour was about 2½ miles long, and that its breadth varied from 250 to 700 yards. [See A. E. E. Desjardins, *Géogr. de la Gaule rom.* vol. i. pl. xv.] Would it have been possible for 800 small vessels, which had oars as well as sails, and which drew not more than 3 feet of water, to get out of it in one tide?' Capt. Iron's answer was, 'Yes, because they would have had from one hour after to one hour before low water.' But it is hardly safe to accept Desjardins's delineation of the harbour as absolutely accurate.

⁷ See the preceding note.

⁸ *B.G.* v. 8, § 2.

⁹ *Ib.* §§ 2, 5–6.

¹⁰ *Ib.* § 2.

extended to lifting the anchor'; but it is very unlikely that Caesar uses it in this sense, for he repeatedly describes the operation of weighing anchor by the words *sublati ancoris*.¹ It may therefore be safely concluded that if Portus Itius was Boulogne, the ships, as they passed out of the harbour, were moored alongshore outside until the signal was given for the whole fleet to set sail. Now, however closely they may have been moored, we can hardly allow a less breadth of front for each than 7 yards.² The ships then would have extended in a row more than 5600 yards long,—about 5 kilometres, or more than 3 miles; in other words, they would have reached from the mouth of the Liane two-thirds of the way to Ambleteuse! Does this agree with the datum that they sailed from Portus Itius?

The danger of anchoring or of mooring alongshore would of course have been increased if the operation of clearing the harbour had required more than one tide. North-westerly winds had been blowing for twenty-five days before Caesar sailed from Portus Itius; and when the wind backed to the south-west it would have been most important to seize the opportunity of sailing while it lasted. By making Wissant the starting-point this advantage would have been secured; and, although it would not have been possible to make as good a run to Britain before a south-west wind from Wissant as from Boulogne,

¹ *B.G.* iv. 23, § 6; *B.C.* i. 31, § 3; ii. 22, § 3; 25, § 7.

² The ships were small, but comparatively broad; 540 of them carried 5 legions with their auxiliaries, camp equipage and stores, 2000 troopers, 2000 cavalry horses, remounts, and baggage cattle (*B.G.* v. 1, § 2; 2, § 2; 5, § 2; 8, §§ 1-2). Their breadth of beam cannot have been less than 15 feet and was probably rather more. The breadth of one of the great merchant-ships of the Mediterranean, the dimensions of which have been recorded by Lucian, was, as Mr. Torr points out (*Ancient Ships*, 1894, p. 24), 'slightly more than a fourth of the length'; and Caesar says that the breadth of the ships which he designed was proportionally greater than that of the Mediterranean craft. The breadth of Napoleon's 'bateaux canonnières,' which were 60 feet long and drew only 4½ feet of water, was 14 feet (E. Desbrière, *Projets et tentatives*, etc. iii. 1902, p. 90). If Caesar's ships had all been moored in actual contact with one another (!), the line would have been over 4000 yards long.

although the labour of hauling up and hauling down the ships at Wissant would have been great, these disadvantages may not have been considered too high a price to pay for the advantages of security, certainty, and a simultaneous start.

Professor Camille Jullian, of the Institut and the Collège de France, who has seen the rough draft of this paper, writes to me, 'Je ne vois pas en faveur de Wissant que le nombre donné par César, et je me demande si le pays est assez peuplé, assez fertile, assez près des bonnes routes pour nourrir une armée de 10 [read 8] légions.' I would remind my friend that even if the number of ships given by Caesar—'more than 800'—is not correct (and there is surely no reason to question it), they must have been several times as numerous as the hundred or so which had sufficed in the previous year; for they were evidently much smaller, they had to carry five legions and 2000 cavalry instead of two legions, and they included 'private vessels.' The other considerations which my friend adduces were emphasized in my article. But the comparative infertility of the country, its sparse population, and its want of good roads would not have been fatal if it was possible, as it surely was, to provision the army for a few weeks by sea or by pack-horses, which could have moved on tracks that would have been impracticable for wagons.

One may imagine that if Caesar could have foreseen the complaints that have been so often made as to the insufficiency of the data which the *Commentaries* contain for determining this question, he would have said 'Your criticisms are hasty. Exercise your intelligence and inform yourselves, and you will find that I have told you enough. When I said that I chose the shortest passage and that the distance from Portus Itius to Britain was about 30 miles I made it clear that Portus Itius was either Boulogne or Wissant; and on that point you are now agreed. My account of the adventures of my cavalry transports was sufficient to show those of you who understood seamanship that they sailed not from Sangatte or from Wissant but from Ambleteuse, and consequently that on my first expedition I sailed from Boulogne. I did so because Boulogne was the port, from which

most Gallic trading vessels regularly sailed, and was, in the circumstances, the most convenient starting-point: my ships were too large to be hauled up on a beach out of the reach of spring tides, and, being comparatively few, they could clear the harbour in a single tide. Nevertheless, they were unavoidably strung out, and I had to wait several hours off the Kentish cliffs before the stragglers arrived. The fact that I made no mention of Portus Itius except in connexion with my second expedition naturally suggested to some of you that I did not sail from it on my first. That clue you ought to have followed. If you assumed that because Boulogne possessed many advantages over Wissant, it possessed that advantage which, on my second expedition, was indispensable; if you failed to reflect that I could not have got my eight hundred ships out of Boulogne harbour without their being dispersed, you cannot blame me. As I told you, I designed my new vessels expressly in order to enable them to be hauled up on dry land: I sailed from Wissant on my second expedition because from Wissant alone was it possible for them to start simultaneously; and if Wissant was not used by my successors, it was because their circumstances were wholly different from mine.'

I have allowed myself to make this flight of fancy because I wished to give prominence to the claim of Wissant. But it is enough to have shown that the case for Boulogne cannot be regarded as proved, because, if there is only one really strong argument for Wissant, that argument is so strong that it cannot be set aside. I have stated the reasons which led me to revise my opinion; and the reader now has at his disposal all the data necessary to enable him to form his own.

May I suggest that an attempt should be made to determine the question by excavation?¹ I am not sure whether the ground on which Caesar would have encamped if he had sailed from Wissant is undisturbed; but I venture to express the hope that, if excavation is practicable, MM. Salomon Reinach and Camille Jullian will make the necessary arrangements and invite subscriptions. I would gladly contribute what I can afford.

T. RICE HOLMES.

[Note.—On pages 586–7 of *Ancient Britain* I said that 'it may be regarded as certain that the draught of Caesar's transports [in 54 B.C.] was much less than five feet.' This statement is misleading though the error does not affect my argument: probably, however, the draught of the beamy shallow vessels which Caesar designed for his second invasion was not more than five feet. Evidently they were much smaller than the Gallic transports which he had used in the previous year; for about 80 + 18 (say 100) of the latter had sufficed to carry two legions with their complement of cavalry, whereas 600 of the former were built to carry five legions and 2000 cavalry. Even the Gallic transports drew so little water that it was possible for the troops whom they carried to jump off them into the sea. Allowing for the projection of the bows, from which the men doubtless jumped, and assuming that the ships sank 18 inches or 2 feet in the bed of the sea (*Ancient Britain*, p. 673), we may suppose that their draught was from 8 to 9 feet. Again, the largest of the transports which Napoleon built for the invasion of England were designed to carry each 38 seamen, 120 soldiers, and 12 24-pounder guns, and their draught was only 8 feet; while the vessels called *bateaux canonnières*, which were designed to carry each 6 seamen, 100 soldiers, 2 horses, and 2 guns, only drew 4½ feet of water (E. Desbrière, *Projets et tentatives de débarquement*, etc. iii. 1902, pp. 90, 92).

¹ Probably Labienus's camp was distinct from Caesar's; for if eight legions had occupied one camp, the three which Caesar left with Labienus when he sailed for Britain might have had difficulty in defending it.

NOTES

ARNOBIUS VII. 18 (252. 14).

minus gratior et iucundior sanguis est.

For *minus* read *sinus*. *Sinus* (or *sinum*) is by Varro joined with *capis*, *capida* ('sinorum et capidarum species') and *capis* (Livy x. 7) is sacrificial: 'cum capide et litus victimam caedat.' Karl Meiser (*Studien zu Arnobius*, p. 36) prefers *magis*, saying,

NO. CCI. VOL. XXIII.

'*minus* ist verderbt für *magis*, das öfter beim Komparativ steht, z. B. 19. 24, *magis rectius*, 165. 30, *magis*, . . . *ignominiosius* s. den Index von Reifferscheid.' This *magis*, if read, would still be 'a dish, platter or vat,' *μαγίς*, and not the adverb.

vii. 50 (284. 10),

cur non minaei forti se obtulit?

F

Here *forti*, or *forte*, may be for *fortem* simply, a much readier emendation than Meiser's *torrenti*, which *ist vielleicht zu lesen*.

v. 7 (180, 4),

mater suffodit *etas* deum, unde amygdalus nascitur amaritudinem significans funeris.

Read m.s. *deitas* deum, *-dit etas* giving that reading fairly, and *deitas* being a word of Arnobius, S. Augustine, Prudentius and S. Jerome. Indeed, Prudentius says expressly (in *Apoth.* v. 144): 'et hoc verbo uti jam nostros non piget, ut e Graeco expressius transferant quod illi θεότητα appellat.' The Germans have gone far afield in explanation and reading, K. Meiser (*Studien zu A.*) saying: 'für *etas* vermute ich Attin,'—Helm thinking Attis = 'etos' (consuetudo)—and Reifferscheid reading at *et iam*, to Otto Gruppe's amusement. For amygdalus . . . amaritudinem significans funeris compare *Ecclesiastes* xii. 5, which Arnobius explains here. For the interchange of 'e' and 'i' in above reading, a good instance in point is given in the *Neue Bruchstücke aus Weingartener Itala-Handschriften von Paul Lehmann* (München, 1908): καὶ τί ὑμεῖς ἐμοί, Τύρος καὶ Σιδὼν; *et adhuc* vos mihi, T. et S.? where the Latin betrays a reading καὶ ἔτι (κάτι) [p. 33 on Joel iv. 4]. H. JOHNSON.

μέτασσαι.

THIS word, which occurs only once, i. 221 χωρὶς μὲν πρόγονοι, χωρὶς δὲ μέτασσαι—in *Hymnus Merc.* 125 μέτασσα of M has been emended to μέταζε—is, so far as the sense goes, fairly clear. Suidas explains it as τὰ ὑπαρῶν πρόβατα, Eustathius, 1625, 29, as αἱ μεσήλικες, which is in all probability the true interpretation: sunt igitur agnelli qui medii inter προγόνους et ἔρσας nati sunt, Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.* p. 1079. The etymology of the word, on the other hand, is more uncertain. Curtius, L. Meyer, Vaníček and Grassmann favour the analysis into μετα-κι-αι, while Ebel, *K.Z.* i. 302, iv. 207, prefers μετα-τι-αι. Grassmann, *K.Z.* xi. 29 f, derives περισσός, ἐπισσαι, μέτασσαι, Ἀμφισσα, Ἀντισσα from περικιο-, etc. comparing Skt. *prāti: prafid.* It is pointed out by Schmidt, *Pluralbildung*, p. 397 n., that though this explanation might suit μέτασσαι, it will not

do for ἐπισσαι, Ἀμφισσα, where, instead of -ισσ-, -ιασσ- would be required on Grassmann's assumption. Prellwitz, *Etym. Wb.* p. 310, compares νεοσσός < *veFo-tekios: τίκτω, *das junge, neugeborne Tier*. I would make still another suggestion. May not μέτασσαι be simply μετα-σῃται > μέτ-ασσαι, cf. Doric ἔασσα, Cretan ἰαθθα, < εσῃτα? The original sense of μέτα, Goth. *miþ*, was 'between,' 'among,' Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*³, p. 444, and so we get for μέτασσαι the meaning 'those that come, are between,' i.e. between the πρόγονοι and the ἔρσαι, which satisfies Eustathius' definition μεσήλικες.

King's College, Aberdeen.

J. FRASER.

EMENDATION in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vi. 116 (Commentary on Thucydides ii.). Grenfell and Hunt give: ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐ κ[.]ν. May not the missing words be κατὰ ἀπαρτισμόν? Cp. Dionys. Halic. *de Comp. Verb.* c. 21, ἀλλ' ἔστι τῶν ἐν πλάτει θεωρουμένων ὡς ἀγέλη τε καὶ σὼρος καὶ ἄλλα πολλά. id. *ib.* c. 24, ὁρᾷται δ', ὥσπερ ἔφην καὶ πρότερον, οὐ κατὰ ἀπαρτισμόν ἀλλ' ἐν πλάτει, καὶ τὰς εἰδικὰς ἔχει διαφορὰς πολλὰς. Stephanus, s.v. ἀπαρτισμός, has a reference to Gl. Stob. *Ecl.* vol. i., p. 258: τὸ δὲ γινῆναι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐχὶ κατ' ἀπαρτισμόν νοεῖσθαι.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

NOTE to *Classical Review*, 1909, p. 8.—After the article was printed I heard from Professor Dessau that he finds in Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 32, a reference to Καλλίνικος τῶν Κιλικίων ἡγούμενος, who was crucified by Justinian on account of an act of severe justice in his office. The date is not mentioned. There is great probability that this official was the Callinicus mentioned in the inscription of Perta. Cilicia (as distinguished from Cilicia Secunda) was a consular Province. Callinicus must have governed Lycaonia earlier, both because Cilicia was a more honourable and important Province, and because Callinicus held no office later than Cilicia. The inscription mentions δύο δεσπότας, presumably either Justin I. and Justinian, A.D. 527, or Justinian and Theodora (who were colleagues), 527–548. Thus the date is fixed within comparatively narrow limits.

In part of the article mentioned I did not see a proof. On p. 8, col. B, the reference to the first section of the Prooemium to Theophilus is falsely printed, and in the footnote φιλοτιμηθείσας is wrongly printed instead of φιλοτιμηθείσαι.

W. M. RAMSAY.

REVIEWS

THE GREEK VERSIONS OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited from nine MSS., together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and some Hebrew Fragments, by R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 6¼" x 9¼". Pp. lx + 324. 18s. net.

AMONG the half dozen scholars who have made a special study of Jewish apocryphal writings, Dr. Charles holds an honourable place. He has given long years to diligent and determined examination, appraisal and affiliation of MSS. containing works rarely read to-day by students even, important though they are for the proper understanding of early Christian thought. The volume now before us will be indispensable to students of these Testaments in our generation. Dr. Sinkler's editions of 1869 and 1879 preceded the scientific treatment of manuscript tradition, and Dr. Charles is entitled to the honour of establishing certain theories about the origin and history of this work, which it is improbable that we shall see discredited. Briefly, the editor shows that the book was originally written in Hebrew, and was thence translated into Greek. From the Greek derive an Armenian version, in two forms, and a Slavonic, also in two forms. The Greek MSS. too on examination prove to exhibit two types of text, and Dr. Charles holds that the Hebrew itself must have existed in two recensions.

Unfortunately, the editor seriously prejudices his cause by the extraordinary method he has adopted of presenting his argument. He throws together proofs strong and feeble, and gives the reader no hint that he is conscious of any difference in their cogency. The result is that he runs a grave danger of having the strength of his case misunderstood, and indeed of having judgment given against it because the evidence may not be completely examined. He classifies his proofs that the Greek version

is a translation from the Hebrew under four headings, and on each of these it is worth while to make a few comments.

First, 'Hebrew constructions and expressions are to be found on every page. Though the vocabulary is Greek, the idiom is frequently Hebraic and foreign to the genius of the Greek language.' His examples under this head are of such a character in many instances as to betray either an inacquaintance with the work of Deissmann and Prof. J. H. Moulton, or a rejection of their views, which is impermissible even to the Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint at Oxford, unless he develops at length his reasons for doing so. Thus κλοπή ἐκλεψαν, Test. Jos. xii. 2 has been paralleled from papyri and T. Sim. iv. 4, ἡγάπησέ (misprinted on p. xxiv as ἡγάπησά) με σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου = as (he did) my brothers, is like a use of μετὰ found in Attic. Other examples depend on a misunderstanding of the text. Thus he quotes (p. xxiv) T. Lev. xviii. 10¹ with the comment, 'Ἀδάμ = אדם, and should here be rendered by ἀνθρώπους.' But the reference is plainly to Gen. iii. 24. Curiously enough, he does not quote what might have furnished him with a good argument, T. Sym. vi. 4.

Next, 'Dittographic renderings of the same Hebrew phrase, and expressions in the Greek implying dittographs in the Hebrew MS. before the translator.' Most of these invoke that subjective spirit of criticism which the discoveries of papyri in the last seventeen years have so greatly discredited. The editor would have carried conviction more quickly if he had confined himself to a few examples like that in T. Naph. vi. 2, where the one class of MSS. has ἐκτὸς ναυτῶν = בלח נאח, while the other has μεστὸν ταρίχων = מלוחים מלח. This, however, would lead us no

¹ καὶ γε αὐτὸς ἀνοίξει τὰς θύρας τοῦ παραδείσου, καὶ ἀποστήσει τὴν ἀπειλοῦσαν βομφαλὴν κατὰ τοῦ Ἀδάμ.

farther than the theory that one class of MSS. had been translated from Hebrew.

Thirdly, 'paronomasiae which are lost in Greek can be restored by retranslation into Hebrew.' As for these, it must be said, they show no more than that the writer knew Hebrew; they do not prove that he wrote in that language. Moreover, how uncertain an argument this may be is evidenced by the fact that it would prove St. James' Epistle to have been written in English, because in i. 6 'he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed,' the English has a charming play which is absent in the Greek.

Lastly, 'Many passages which are obscure or wholly unintelligible in the Greek become clear on retranslation into Hebrew.' Out of a number of examples which again depend too much on subjective considerations, one or two are conclusive; e.g. T. Lev. ii. 8, where in both groups of MSS. the second heaven is πολλὸν φωτεινότερον καὶ φαιδρότερον, because ἦν καὶ ὕψος ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπειρον, where ὕψος = מַגְדָּל is a misreading for מַגְדָּל = φέγγος or φῶς. So T. Jud. xxi. 6, οἱ μὲν κινδυνεύουσιν αἰχμαλωτιζόμενοι, οἱ δὲ πλουτοῦσιν ἀρπάζοντες τὰ ἀλλότρια may plausibly be explained as a mistranslation of what in earlier Hebrew = πτωχεύουσιν. But T. Jud. iv. 3 may well be not a mistranslation but a misunderstanding of the Midrash by the author, and ix. 3 is no more convincing than T. Dan. i. 8 and iv. 4. In T. Jos. xi. 7, ἐπλήθυνεν αὐτὸν ἐν χρυσίῳ καὶ ἀργυρίῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, the last word may be a mistranslation for 'household servants,' but it might = 'farm,' and in T. Benj. iv. 2,

σκοτεινὸν ὀφθαλμόν may be further illustrated by St. Matt. vi. 22 ff.

When Dr. Charles goes on to deduce two lost Hebrew recensions from which the Greek are derived respectively, it is doubtful if he makes good his case. It would suffice to postulate (1) a translation made from a Hebrew MS. misread, misunderstood, mistaken in places; (2) a revised translation, where the former version was checked and corrected by comparison with another Hebrew MS. But again the editor injures his case by throwing together good and bad examples. Certainly T. Naph. iii. 2 may well be a Greek corruption, οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦσι becoming οὐ καλύψουσι. Weak instances like this make the reader distrust the strength of the argument, and Dr. Charles has certainly not stated adequately his case for supposing the book to have been interpolated so early that all our MSS. contain identical additions. I have no space to enlarge on this, nor to do more than point out the impropriety of assuming—as is commonly done—that ὅς ἂν διδάσκει implies the use of ἂν with the indicative. Because the past indicative and the subjunctive of *to be* are identical in spelling, it does not follow that we are unconscious of a grammatical difference between them, nor would an inference that there was confusion be legitimised, if we should begin to spell *bare* and *bear* in one way.

Of misprints I have noted: p. 132, note 51, αἶμα for αἶμα; p. 192, line 6, συγγενῇ for συγγένῃ; p. 204, line 9, ἐφόβοντο; and p. 277, xii. 4, ὁ (for δ) πρῶτον.

T. NICKLIN.

TWO STUDIES IN GREEK AUTHORSHIP.

Hellenistische Wundererzählungen. Von R. REITZENSTEIN. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1906. 8vo. Pp. vi + 172. M. 5.

Lucian und Menipp. Von RUDOLF HELM. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1906. 8vo. Pp. vi + 392. M. 10.

THESE two books attempt to solve a problem which lies at the very foundation of criticism,

namely, how does a writer, or a group of writers, make use of material ready to hand. Mr. Helm is content to deal with the way in which Lucian fell back upon Menippus; Mr. Reitzenstein tries to show that ancient biography and history was largely the writing of anecdotes with a moral. To describe this method, he falls back upon the term 'aretalogy.' This term is to mean both the

wonderful works and the sayings of great men, and of the gods. Thus the Son of Sirach can say, even of God, 'fill Sion with thy majesty' (ἀρεταλογία), xxxvi. 17.

Such is the simple formula with which Mr. Reitzenstein solves the difficulties, which beset the student of ancient history and biography. Prophets, philosophers and historians display but little knowledge of what is real and true, and along with the biographers, are but little removed from novelists. When Cicero wrote to the historian Luceius, and asked him to compose the history of the orator's exploits, Cicero, forsooth, was anticipating the plot of Chariton's romance of *Chaireas and Callirhoe* (p. 99)! Such are the results of the comparison of the unlike, and of the failure to draw distinctions.

One of the pundits at the recent Congress of the History of Religions said that it was time scholars began to discriminate. To read this speculation of Mr. Reitzenstein where the argument is of so bare a thread and where it rests upon the faintest analogies, is like reading in a dictionary where the alphabet furnishes the succession of topics.

And yet Mr. Reitzenstein has not failed to keep in view the purpose for which his book was composed. For it has been composed with a purpose. He proposes to prove that the methods of early Christian writers are part of a great tradition; that for example the *Acts of the Apostles* was written much in the same way as other short histories. But in order to avoid dogmatic considerations, he has gone outside the province of canonical literature, and has subjected the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* to a comparison with Egyptian and Greek miraculous stories. In particular the two hymns contained in the *Acts of Thomas* are traced to earlier Hellenistic literature, and ultimately to Egyptian sources.

Will it be believed that Mr. Reitzenstein is unable to deal with Egyptian and Coptic sources at first hand? He invented in his previous book, the *Poemandres*, an Hermetic community for which there is no adequate warrant. In reviewing the *Poemandres* elsewhere, I purposely omitted a protest against this unscholarly treatment of a great subject. But others have been less considerate of Mr.

Reitzenstein's feelings, and I gather from a footnote (p. 14), that Mr. Walter Otto has spoken quite clearly upon this matter. I will quote Mr. Reitzenstein against himself. 'The help of friends does not compensate for the lack of knowledge of the language' (p. 103 n). Mr. Reitzenstein makes the reader doubtful, when he speaks of the vulture as *the* divine bird of Egypt without even a reference to the hawk of Horus (p. 21). And the author not being able to read Egyptian, attaches a quite ridiculous importance to isolated phrases taken from the huge and formless mass of Egyptian literature. The present reviewer has but a slight knowledge of things Egyptian. But even a slight knowledge of the Egyptian language dispels the awe with which Mr. Reitzenstein approaches Egyptian tradition. I am sorry to seem ungrateful to Mr. Reitzenstein for the many interesting suggestions which his books contain.

Mr. Helm's book is a valuable contribution to the study of Lucian, and incidentally covers some of the ground traversed by Mr. Reitzenstein. The two writers agree in this, that Lucian's debt to Menippus was considerable. Lucian's object was 'to make Menippus live again' (*Lucian und Menipp*, p. 13), and outside this object Lucian was unsuccessful. Mr. Helm treats in turn of those works of Lucian which owe something to Menippus, apart from whom he says Lucian's invention flags. Mr. Helm, however, has not entirely settled how Lucian stood to Menippus. For there is a serious omission which deserves notice. Much is said about Lucian's lack of invention and of constructive power. But little acknowledgment is made of his undoubted command of style. His fine taste received powerful impulse in the sculptor's workshop, which he early deserted but of which he never lost the remembrance. No one would gather from either of the works under review, that the conception of the antique world should include the balanced sublimity and beauty of which antique sculpture is the symbol, and that here Lucian is of the greatest importance. Lucian, says Professor Ernest Gardner, is undoubtedly the most trustworthy art-critic of antiquity; it is through Lucian's eyes that

we see the most splendid vision of material beauty.

It is a shock, therefore, to pass from Lucian to the inelegant comparison which Mr. Helm has borrowed (p. 343). He quotes a German humorist who says that 'Verses should be sprinkled in a book written in prose, with the same purpose as bacon is sprinkled in sausage.' I wonder what Lucian would have said about the taste of his critic. It may be, after all, that the continued study and imitation of Greek and Roman prose and poetry is needed to keep the Teutonic mind in touch with the beautiful and sublime in style. Recent innovations in classical

studies are based upon the assumption that the vernacular speech of the age is represented by its great writers. This is the opposite of the facts. Lucian's Attic is not more artificial than the dialect which was used for their works by Caesar and Cicero. 'The style is the man.' In the elaborate analysis which forms the staple of the two works under consideration, the human personality disappears. But it is just the touch of the artist that gives greatness and unity to his picture.

F. GRANGER.

University College,
Nottingham.

THE HISTORY OF MORAL IDEAS.

- (1) *De Conscientiae Notione, quae et qualis fuerit Romanis.* By ROELOF MULDER. Lugduni Batavorum: apud E. J. Brill. MCMVIII. Pp. 127.

- (2) *Philosophy and Popular Morals in Ancient Greece.* By A. E. DOBBS, Junr. Dublin: E. Ponsonby; London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1907. Pp. xi + 282. 5s. net.

THESE books are the result of very careful attempts to discover, not only the views of ancient writers on ethics, but also the popular morality which was recognised by the Greeks and Romans.

Dr. Mulder quotes in full the chief passages from Latin literature in which the words 'conscire', 'conscius' and 'conscientia' are found (pp. 6-49), and although 'conscientia' does not occur before the time of Cicero, he infers, not that the term was unknown previously, but that it began then to acquire its moral force.

In the next chapter he argues that 'religio,' as implying an external, prohibiting power, could not develop the idea of conscience, the evolution of which was due to the study of philosophy (particularly of the Stoic system) and its teaching that there was innate in man a divine arbiter of right and wrong.

Finally, after a few remarks about the consciousness of sin (implied in 'fides,'

'pudor,' 'delictum,' etc.) among the Romans in pre-Ciceronian times, a full account is given of 'conscientia' as internal accuser, witness and judge. The writer concludes:

'In religione non tam amor quam timor verecundiae deorum homines, ut deos colerent, impellebant.

'Haec omnia, quominus notio conscientiae cresceret, impedire, quin etiam in rebus, quae ad religionem pertinerent, numquam vocem conscientiae apud Romanos inveniri, supra ostendimus.

'Deinde religione neglecta philosophia munus paedagogi suscepit: sed rursus normae, secundum quas vitam disponere actionesque regere volebant, a recta via declinabant. Conscientiae autem notionem ea aetate, qua philosophia cum Stoicorum tum Platoniorum recentiorum homines, ut in se recederent, monebat, crevisse atque amplificatam esse, satis apparebat' (pp. 118, 119).

The work abounds in illuminating thoughts, e.g. the distinction between 'recta conscientia' (the 'mens sibi conscia recti'), which is an internal law, a guiding power or compass, and 'bona conscientia,' which is the approval of a 'conscience void of offence.' But the writer seems to pay too little attention to the early stage, in which the Romans, under the training of their laws and customs, were gradually becoming more and more conscious of moral responsibility and a sense

of sin. Even 'religio' formed habits of thinking which, later on, developed into deeper moral ideas.

Mr. Dobbs describes first of all the morality of the early Greeks and that current in the period of enlightenment, represented by Euripides, in which the old sanctions ceased to bind thinking men and gave way to philosophic ethics. He then proceeds to trace the reflex influence of philosophy on popular life and thought. The latter subject is novel, and although the writer has scarcely proved that the influence of philosophy was great, he deserves the gratitude of scholars for his candid presentation of the evidence and for the industry with which he has collected references. His account, however, of duty and conscience (p. 165 and Appendix C) is very meagre, and he recognises even less than Dr. Mulder the importance of tracing from the earliest times the sense of sin, a feeling which certainly existed (as shown, e.g. by the word *αἰδώς*), even though imperfect and inarticulate.

English scholars have displayed wonderful industry in expounding the tenets of Plato and Aristotle, but in discussing the growth of popular morals among the Greeks and Romans they appear to have neglected the 'labour of the spade.' Brilliant generalisations, sometimes right, often wrong, are common enough; careful tabulation of the evidence, in chronological order and in relation to institutions, is conspicuously wanting. What is needed is a minute analysis of all the non-philosophic writings, so that an investigator may have at his command what each author says about man's duty to the gods, the state, his family and himself. Doubtless much of this work has been done already, but it is buried in forgotten theses or magazine articles. These

should be unearthed and supplemented, and the evidence published in one or two volumes without comment. The labour involved would be immense, but as only the most important passages need be quoted in full, the volume or volumes would not be very bulky. The writer speaks from experience, as he has already analysed three authors in this way. With such a guide historians would be less apt to forget the effects of time and place, or to couple together Homer and Plutarch (after the manner of L. Schmidt) without realising that they are separated by a thousand years.

Mr. Dobbs, while admitting the value of this method, points out the difficulty of distinguishing between literary and popular ethics. 'The views propounded in books, on the platform, or on the stage, do not always represent the principles of faith and practice generally accepted at the time' (p. 226). But, after all, literature is practically all we have upon which to base our conclusions, and it goes without saying that the historian must not interpret his authorities in a wooden, unintelligent way. Moreover, the 'views propounded in books' do not exhaust the evidence to be obtained from literature. The moral tone which is implied in a remark is often of far greater value than moral judgments definitely expressed. Take, for instance, the light thrown upon the Athenian conception of a 'perfect gentleman' by the following passage of Antiphon:

ὑπερφύον τι ἦν τῆς ἡμετέρας οἰκίας, ὃ εἶχε Φιλόνεως ὁπότ' ἐν ἄστει διατρίβοι, ἀνὴρ καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ φίλος τῷ ἡμετέρῳ πατρί· καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ παλλακή, ἣν ὁ Φιλόνεως ἐπὶ πορνείῳ ἐμελλε καταστήσας.

Κατηγορία φαρμακείας. § 14.

Such evidence as this is far from uncommon.

W. H. S. JONES.

THE ODES OF HORACE.

The Odes of Horace: A Translation and an Exposition. By E. R. GARNSEY. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. 1907. 8vo. Pp. 230. 6s.

MR. GARNSEY has called his book a Translation and an Exposition. The principle

that he has adopted in translating he explains on page 3; he describes it as a rendering 'in metre, but without rhythm or a set scheme of prosody,' and says of it: 'The reader will see that adherence to the "nuance" of thought agreeable to the Latin mind has

often been preferred to the course of making a change to something more congenial to the English ear. The desire for fidelity has been the cause of this, and the risk of uncouthness has been faced in preference to any conscious disturbance of the sense.' Mr. Garnsey's method seems to be to translate, where he reasonably can, into blank verse, but to let any line that will not accommodate itself to the demands of that metre, fend for itself. How far the "nuances" agreeable to the Latin mind have been adhered to is questionable: but that there is reason in his apology for uncouthness may be seen by considering such examples as the following:

Ode i. 27.

'Wish you that I too share the strong Falernian?
Let brother of Megilla the Opuntian
Tell to what wound he has been treated,
And from what dart he dies.'

or *Ode iii. 5.*

'Has soldier of Crassus passed his life,
A dastard husband with a foreign mate?
And in the lands of foes—and fathers-in-law—
(Oh, Senate, oh, perverted morals!) with Mede
For king, have Marsian and Apulian grown old?'

The object of the exposition, to which the translation is but secondary, is to prove that L. Licinius Murena, the brother-in-law of Maecenas, was not only, as Dr. Verrall makes him in his *Studies in Horace*, an important personage in Horace's writings, but the all-pervading source of influence of the *Odes*, which become in his hands a dark political

cryptogram. The events of 22 B.C. produced this *monumentum*, the 'memorial' of this lyrical Mr. Dick. Dr. Verrall has pointed out many possible allusions to Murena; Mr. Garnsey finds him everywhere. To the Murena motive he traces all references to astrology, metempsychosis, physical deformity, heirs, fish ponds, barrages, and extravagance of various kinds. The man had many aliases: he is Sybaris, Pyrrhus, Telephus, Delliis (who has to become Gillo), Grosphus, Gyas, Pirithous, Achilles; he is one of the 'three gentlemen at once' who constitute Cerberus: not content with being the unclaimed *tu* of ii. 18 (as with Dr. Verrall), he lays claim to the pronoun in i. 20. The method by which he is identified with Thaliarchus in Ode i. 9 will serve as an illustration: Soracte is mentioned in the same Ode; Soracte is in the territory of the Hirpini; Hirpus, whence comes the name, means wolf: this suggests Lycaon in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book I., whose banquet is connected with a plot against Augustus. It seems strange that 'the most gentlemanlike of Roman poets' should trouble his generous patron with incessant references to his dishonoured kinsman, even though anxious to show that he did not class them in his mind together. But there is too much Murena, however ingeniously Mr. Garnsey has employed his learning. Henry I. died of a surfeit of lamprey.

A. S. OWEN.

SERVIUS GRAMMATICUS.

Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina Commentarii. THILO and HAGEN. Vol. iii, Fasc. ii. Appendix Serviana. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902. Pref. pp. vii-xiii + 1-540.

WE have here the penultimate volume of Thilo's Servius, the appendix arranged and emended by Hermann Hagen just before his death. Only the indices remained to be done, and a preface in which it was hoped he would address himself to the difficult questions concerning Probus and Philargyrius.

This work will be undertaken by Paul Rabbow, who will thus bring the work to completion. The present volume contains the so-called additions to the Vulgate found in MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries, first published in 1600 by Daniel. It has been generally held that the Danielian additions were not part of the original commentary of Servius, but were transcribed into it from a similar and equally sound work. This volume contains (i) a commentary by Junius Philargyrius on the Eclogues, excerpts from which, now published in full for the first

time, are given in two forms in three MSS. These two forms differ one from another considerably, one being much fuller than the other. One can never tell where a chance piece of information thrown out in these comments will be the missing link in a hitherto broken chain of mythological, literary, or social knowledge, and Mr. Warde Fowler has recently made good use of such a note on Eclogue iv. 63 in his essay on the Messianic Eclogue. (ii) A short anonymous explanation of the Georgics; (iii) a commentary on the Eclogues and Georgics, assigned to Probus; (iv) the Scholia Veronensis; (v) Magni Glossarum libri glossae, to which the name of Virgil is prefixed; (vi) Grammatici incerti Glossae, on Aen. xii.; (vii) Scriptoris incerti Glossarium Vergilianum; and finally (viii) Grammatical Fragments of Asper. As to the commentary on the Georgics, it is no longer assigned (since M. Thomas) to Philargyrius; but its information as to grammar, history, and antiquities is drawn, like that of Servius, from scholars of the first and early second centuries. Nettleship, judging from the remains of the notes of Probus preserved in Servius and

later writers, would assign to him the first place among the commentators of Virgil, whether from the point of view of textual criticism or interpretation. But the bulk of the commentary here preserved he refuses to believe to be the work of Probus. Instead of grammar and criticism (the subjects which Suetonius and his own scattered notes would have us expect), this commentary is concerned with points of mythology, history, and theosophy. We can heartily endorse Nettleship's remark: 'Nor can its quality as a whole, though here and there it gives us a valuable remark, be pronounced at all worthy of what might have been expected from the great scholar of Berytus.' The good quality of the Verona Scholia is well known, 'their air of genuine antiquity, their clearness, fulness, and sanity of view.' Modern commentators cannot dispense with the Verona Scholia as here most carefully edited. We need not here consider the other sections of this volume, which must find a place on the shelves of Virgilian scholars if only for the Philargyrius and Verona Scholia.

S. E. WINBOLT.

TWO BOOKS OF VERSIONS.

Flosculi Graeci Boreales: Series Nova. Aberdeen University Studies, No. 28. Decerpsit JOANNES HARROWER. Aberdeen University Press. 1907.

THIS is a volume for the book-lover, finely printed on goodly paper, and full of good things. It contains a hundred versions in various kinds of Greek verse, with a few epigrams and oddities thrown in. Some of the pieces are of considerable length: one renders a whole scene from Byron's *Marino Faliero*. The greater number of the versions are in iambs, and the iambs are nearly all excellent: to add to the interest, the originals are mostly new, although a few old favourites are repeated. Next in favour come the elegiacs, and these are also the most pleasing to the reader. The iambs sometimes smell of the lamp a little, but the elegiacs are graceful and spontaneous in a high degree.

We may especially mention the versions of A. W. Muir, who is not afraid to compress an English lyric: he has his reward, as may be seen by a comparison of his version on p. 69, and another on p. 151 of Rossetti's song, 'When I am dead, my dearest.' His version is admirable indeed, and all his work is marked by a welcome clearness. He has another charming version (p. 131) of Wordsworth's *Lucy*. Several pieces are Theocritean Doric, which goes well in rendering our native Doric; all these are pretty, especially so one by the editor on p. 31, and an *ὁπαιρτὶς* (p. 233) by Wm. Calder. One or two short sets of Sapphics are not quite so successful. There are also trochaic tetrameters, anacreontics (rather free in rhythm), and one or two choral pieces. Certain versions are unsuccessful because the English is unsuitable; one is 'Crossing the Bar,' in which the last couplet reads

more confused in Greek even than in English, through no fault of the translator. We cannot pretend to have compared all the translations with their text as if examining for the Tripod, but we have noted hardly anything to find serious fault with. Perhaps the rhythm of the Theocriteans is not always quite sound (e.g. p. 30, line 6), the Anacreontics allow a variation of -- and =- in the first foot, and μετὰ γυνῶς (p. 235) is better avoided; surely Cordelia's truth is πίστις, not ἀλήθεια (p. 85). A few lighter pieces complete the volume: please note 'Mary had a Little Lamb,' in charming anacreontics.

Nugae Latinae: Verses and Translations by the late Edward Conolly, of Merton College, Oxford. Edited by Rev. T. L. PAPILLON. Oxford: Blackwell. 1908. 25. net.

A BRIEF memoir precedes this booklet, explaining that 'verse-writing' was the solace of the author's life in time of trouble. The pieces given are few, but all delicately finished. Mr. Conolly prefers the lighter lyric or quasi-lyric metres, and he uses them with complete ease. Two versions are especially striking: both in trochaic tetrameter. One renders 'Der König in Thule' in old-fashioned style; the other, 'Lead Kindly Light.' Each easily puts two lines of English into one of Latin.

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.
Vol. xvii. 1906. Pp. 185. 6s. 6d. net.

MR. MORGAN leads off with a few detached notes on the text, subject matter, and date of Vitruvius. The most interesting point as to the text is the question whether a dative can be joined to *dignus*. He might have cited the parallel dative with *ἀξίος* and, as that suggests, have drawn a distinction. 'I am worthy of death' is different from 'This is worthy of (a worthy thing for) Venus,' and the latter would seem likelier to admit a dative. Mr. Rand argues in a very readable paper from material collected by others that Virgil was by no means adverse to Catullus and that he shows in fact no small liking and admiration for him. Except perhaps as regards Horace, Mr. Rand controverts the idea that Catullus was depreciated by the Augustans. Mr. Minton Warren gives an account of five Roman MSS. of Donatus on Terence, not used in Wessner's edition, and Mr. Moore maintains that the *taurobolium* originated in the worship of the Great Mother herself in Asia Minor. Prof. H. Weir Smyth prints his presidential address to the American Philological Association on 'Aspects of Greek Conservatism,' dealing mainly with the fixity of types and some other conservative traditions in Greek literature. About political, social or speculative matters he has less to say. Dr.

W. W. Goodwin recurs to the Battle of Salamis and urges further with modifications the view he has previously put forward about the movements of the Persian fleet. Prof. J. W. White argues that not only in the *Lysistrata* and one part of the *Acharnians* but generally in Aristophanes the chorus falls constantly into two divisions, and—what is his special point—that we may recognise a good deal as said or sung by the leader of a second half-chorus as distinguished from the coryphaeus who leads the first half and at other times the two halves together. In the lack of clear evidence the matter is very doubtful, but Mr. White's suggestions deserve careful consideration, founded as they are on minute study and sober judgment. Dr. J. H. Wright, dismissing the idea that the *cave* in Plato's *Republic* was suggested by anything in Empedocles, or again that the Corycian cave on Parnassus or the Syracusan quarries had anything to do with it, starts the interesting theory that a cave at Vari on Hymettus ('finally and fully explored in February, 1901, by students of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens') was in Plato's mind. Running parallel with the back wall of the cave, he says, for about eighty feet and at a distance of fourteen is a platform of stone, raised some feet above the floor. Images and votive offerings have been found on the spot. Tradition connects the infant Plato

with Hymettus, though not explicitly with the Vari cave. Mr. Chase writes on an amphora; Mr. Parker on Seneca's *Sacer intra nos spiritus* (Ep. 41), contending that *spiritus* represents energy more than anything else, and that πνεῦμα in St. Paul has the same meaning: it is as energy that the spirit is opposed to the enslaving flesh, not as abstract Platonic

thought (νοῦς) or as modern mystical personality. Finally, Mr. Howard examines in detail the relation of Livy to Valerius Antias with the view of showing that Livy, far from following Valerius blindly, had the greatest possible distrust of his authority.

H. RICHARDS.

SHORT NOTICES

HEGEMONIUS: *ACTA ARCHELAI*.

Hegemonius: Acta Archelai, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der K. Preuss. Ak. der Wiss. Von CHARLES HENRY BEESON. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1906. lvi + 134. Price M. 6.

THE *Acta Archelai*, which has served for a long time as an important source for our knowledge of Manichaeism, has till recently been known only in an imperfect form. It was suspected that it was incomplete, and this has been placed beyond question by Traube's discovery of a manuscript containing the complete Latin text. This has now been edited for the series known as *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte*, by Mr. C. H. Beeson. He has prefixed an admirable introduction dealing with the references to it in literature; the original language, which in common with most recent scholars he believes to have been Greek, not Syriac; the Latin translation; the manuscripts and their relation to each other. There is an excellent critical apparatus and exhaustive indices, those for the Greek and Latin words deserving special praise. The author has not shrunk from putting conjectural emendations in his text, for example Routh's 'parabolam' for 'paruulam' in chapter 67. The chief interest of the work lies, however, in the new portion. The older text broke off in the most tantalising way in the middle of a very important quotation from Basilides, which seemed to several scholars definitely to pledge the great heresiarch to the recognition of two original independent principles,

light and darkness. Other scholars considered that while the author of the *Acta* took Basilides to be a dualist, the quotation did not necessarily bear out this inference. The new material is extremely interesting, but it does not seem definitely to settle the question whether Basilides endorsed the description of Persian dualism which he gave. It is very regrettable that the author did not prolong his quotation. In view of the sensational discovery of primitive Manichaean documents at Turfan, the importance of the *Acta* for our knowledge of Manichaeism will be much diminished, and if we could only be lucky enough to recover the *Exegetica* of Basilides we should be able to solve a problem which the additional material in the new manuscript of Hegemonius, in spite of Bousset's contrary opinion in his *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, seems to leave much where it was.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

Le Droit Pénal Romain. Par TH. MOMMSEN. Traduit de l'allemand avec l'autorisation de la famille de l'auteur et l'éditeur allemand par J. DUQUESNE, professeur à la faculté de droit de Grenoble. Volumes I-III. Pp. xvi, 401, 443, 420. Paris: Fontemoing, 1907. Fr. 30.

IN default of an English translation of MommSEN's standard work on *Römisches Strafrecht* this competent and readable version in French by Professor Duquesne will prove a boon to the considerable number of English and American students who cannot read German or prefer to read French. The book is strictly a translation, the only alterations

introduced in addition to those warranted by the errata in the German edition, are a few corrections of indisputable mistakes; the change of *perduellis* (ii. p. 234 = 538) to *perduellio* would appear then to be an accident. The pagination of the original is given in the margin, and a full index is promised, the German one being insufficient. The tribute which the translator pays to the author may be quoted here: 'Il fallait, en effet, pour répondre aux exigences de tous

dans le domaine du droit pénal, réunir les connaissances du jurisconsulte, de l'historien et du philologue; or Mommsen les possédait toutes à un degré rare. Conçu et exécuté par un tel savant, le livre ne pouvait être qu'une œuvre magistrale appelée à une grande renommée et à un long avenir. Les espérances n'ont pas été déçues et tous les juges compétents s'accordent à reconnaître que l'édifice construit est "solide comme le granit."'

NEWS AND COMMENTS

MR. B. G. TEUBNER (Leipzig) asks purchasers of Brandt's *Eclogae Poetarum Latinorum* to communicate with him, if they have any suggestions to make as to a new edition. He wishes to know whether they find the selection meets their wants, or whether they would recommend any change, omission, or addition. Letters may be addressed to Mr. Nutt.

THE two longest papers in the *Classical Quarterly* for April are Mr. T. W. Allen's dissertation on the meaning of Argos in Homer and Mr. A. T. Martin's examination of an inscription to Mars found at Caerwent. Mr. Cook Wilson writes on the use of ἀλλ' ἢ in Aristotle and points out in a shorter paper that Miss D. Mason's explanation of Philobus 31c has been anticipated. Mr. W. R. Paton contributes suggestions on the first six books of the Laws of Plato. The later Greeks are well represented in the number. Mr. Tucker emending Strabo and Plutarch's *Moralia* and Mr. Richards the Philostrati, while Mr. Kronenberg has a few notes on M. Antoninus. The editor, writing on 'Some Tibullian problems,' discusses Mr. Warde Fowler's theory of Tibullus II. i. as published in the *Classical Review* of March, 1908. The reviews comprise Traube's 'Nomina Sacra' and posthumous works by Mr. Lindsay, Henderson's 'Civil War and Rebellion,' by Mr. E. G. Hardy, Bianca Bruno's 'Third Samnite War,' by Miss Matthaei, and 'A

Sketch-book of Ancient Rome,' by Mr. Ashby.

BESIDES the representations of the *Frogs* at Oxford and the *Iphigenia* at Cardiff, there are other signs of the vivifying of classical work. Miss Ethel Wilkinson of Chicago describes in the *Classical Journal* the acting of Roman scenes in a way that gives scope for much originality. In one class a Latin debate was held on the punishment of the Catilinarian conspirators. 'The teacher's chair represented the sella curulis, the ordinary seats the subsellia, a side aisle the lobby where Cicero's son-in-law Piso stood. . . . Some had the part of tribunes stationed near the door, others were lictors. The auspices were declared favorable. . . . We had a number of short speeches in addition to those on record by Decimus Silanus, Cato and Caesar.' Since the pupils knew they were to act later, they took a keen interest in the preliminary reading of the fourth against Catiline.

Another class acted the meeting of the senate described by Cicero in his third speech before the people. Volturcius was brought in alone and cross-examined, afterwards the Allobroges, and then the conspirators, one by one, were confronted with their seal and handwriting, and obliged to own them. The thread was cut, and the contents of the waxed tablets read. During the cross-examination, Sulpicius rushed in

breathless, bearing an armful of poles (the weapons from Cethegus' house). Another class acted the trial of Archias in the same way.

Hints for similar scenes may be found in most of the ancient orations. For example, Zenothemis makes a very good series of scenes for beginners in Greek. Others, depending more on invention, may be found in the teacher's appendix to Walters & Conway's *Limen*.

THE 'FROGS' AT OXFORD.

LIKE all revivals of Greek plays, the recent representation of the *Frogs* was at once helped and embarrassed by the success of a former production. The immense popularity of the 1892 play has become a legend, and subsequent performances are bound to suffer by comparison: at the same time, the earlier experience of Oxford and Radley supplied many useful hints, sometimes warnings, more often examples, of which recent stage management was able to take full advantage: and it may be fairly said that in point of archaeological correctness, artistic effect, stage machinery and *mise en scène* generally, this year's representation improved on both its predecessors, and did infinite credit to the O.U.D.S. and their collaborators—notably to Mr. Cyril Bailey, the guiding spirit of the whole. All that criticism can suggest is that perhaps improvement and imitation can go a little too far in exploiting the (of course abundant) opportunities for comic business. For instance, the 'corpse' achieved an extraordinary popularity in 1892—in its place: ought it therefore to appear as a comic *κωφὸν πρόσωπον* in the latter part of the play? Again, the *βρεκεκεκέξ* scene was really spoilt by the introduction of small boys dressed as frogs,—however much this may have amused the children themselves and their families. But these are small matters.

If no two actors quite competed with the

Euripides-Dionysus combination of seventeen years ago, what was noticeable this year was the general average of competence throughout. The minor performers were uniformly good: Heracles had a gift of truly Heracleian laughter, Aeacus maintained the best traditions of his part, and Charon, with his far-away suggestion of a 'bus-conductor in the nether world, was quite excellent. Moreover, Greek seemed to be familiar to a larger proportion of the cast than is usual on these occasions. Among the more important rôles, Mr. Corbett's Euripides was the best piece of acting in the play—quiet, restrained, dignified, and showing also an unusual familiarity with the stage. The only question was whether Aristophanes did not intend Euripides to be a little more ridiculous. M. de Stein entered into the part of Xanthias with great humour. The rôle of Dionysus is extremely difficult: like Hamlet, he is on the stage nearly all the time: and no two critics agree as to how the part should be acted. Certainly it is wrong to make him an aesthete: probably to present him as a keen-witted and rather cynical and also rather effeminate man of the world is nearer the mark. Under the circumstances it is not to be wondered at that M. Howard as Dionysus seemed rather more conscious of what he had to avoid than what he had to aim at: and his representation was rather colourless in consequence: but the fault such as it was lay more in the conception, or want of conception, than in the acting, and he deserved credit for grappling manfully with difficulties which perhaps could hardly be overcome.

Taking the play as a whole, the impression of the acting is one of pervading merit rather than pre-eminent brilliance. But the chorus may be praised without any qualification. They moved as they should and they sang Sir Hubert Parry's music as it ought to be sung: it is even said that they satisfied their conductor. Few who saw the play will forget the delightful effect of the *χωρῶμεν ἐς πολυῤῥόδους λειμῶνας* movement.

Φ.

VERSIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

FOR GREEK ELEGIACS.

TAKE me away, and in the lowest deep
 There let me be,
 And there in hope the lone night-watches
 keep
 Told out for me.
 There soul-refreshed and happy in my pain,
 Lone, not forlorn,—
 There will I sing my sad perpetual strain,
 Until the morn.

NEWMAN, *The Dream of Gerontius*.

(Set in the Classical Tripas, Cambridge, Feb. 22, 1882.)

IDEM GRAECE.

Ἴδ' αἰ τις εἰα λαβὼν ποτιθές μ' ὑπὸ βένθεσι
 γαίης,
 δὸς τέ μοι τῇλε φίλων κείσθαι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ·
 ἔλπιδας ἐνθα τρέφω μακρὰς διὰ νυκτὸς αὔπνους
 ἐν δνοφεροῖς κενθμοῖς ἄμαρ ἐπ' ἄμαρ ἄγων.
 ἐνθαδὲ μόνος ἔων, μάλα δ' ὀλβιος, ἄλγεα κρύψω
 ἐντοσθεν πραπίδων τήνδ' ἀναπαύλαν ἔχων.
 λήξω δ' οὔποθ' ὀλῆς λιγυρῶς διὰ νυκτὸς αἰεῖν
 ἐν θνήοις μινυροῖς δακρύνεσσαν ὄπα.

J. HUDSON.

Pet. Coll. and Seatonian (University)
 Prizeman.

PRINCE'S GRAVE.

Here in his grave above the lonely sea
 Sleeps Prinnie, faithful to the last to me.
 No more he'll roam these hills and dales,
 no more
 Will breast the waves upon the windy shore:
 His times are over and his sun is set;
 His dear old self lives on in memory yet!

W. H. SAVILE.

Μνήμα τόδ', ὦ παριών, ὑπὲρ ἀτρυγέτοιο
 θαλάσσης
 ἡρίον εἰσαθρεῖς πιστοτάτου σκύλακος.
 οὐκέτ' ἂν οὔρεα μακρὰ κυλινδεται, οὐκέτ' ἂν
 ἄγκη,
 οὐκέτι δὴ παίζει κύμασι νηχόμενος·
 ἥελιος δὲ δέδυκε οἱ ὕστατον. ἀλλ' ἄρ' ἔτ' αὐτὸς
 ζῶει ἀέμνηστος δεσπότης ἐν κραδίῳ.

R. C. SEATON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

. Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

Aristophanes. The Acharnians of Aristophanes. With introduction, critical notes and commentary by W. Rennie, M.A. 8" x 5". Pp. viii + 280. London, Edward Arnold. 1909. Cloth, 6s. net.

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics. Book VI. With essays, notes, and translation by L. H. G. Greenwood, M.A. 8½" x 5½". Pp. viii + 214. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth, 6s. net.

Augustine. Sancti Aurelii Augustini Episcopi de civitate Dei libri XXII. Tertium recognovit B. Dombart. Vol. I. Lib. i-xiii. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7½" x 4½". Pp. xxxiv + 600. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 5; geb. in Leinwand, M. 5.60.

Baker (Charles M'Coy) and *Inglis* (Alexander James) High School Course in Latin Composition. 7½" x 5". Pp. xiv + 464. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Cloth, 5s.

Bentley (Richard), D.D. A Bibliography of his works and of all the literature called forth by his acts or his writings, by A. T. Bartholomew, M.A. With an introduction and chronological table by J. W. Clark, M.A. 8½" x 6½". Pp. xx + 116. Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes. 1908. Linen back, 7s. 6d. net.

Boni (Giacomo) Trajan's Column. (*From the Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. III.) 9½" x 6½". Pp. 6. London, Henry Frowde. 1909. 1s. net.

Brugmann (Karl) and *Delbrück* (Berthold) Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Band II. Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch; von Karl Brugmann. Teil II. Lief. 1. Zweite Bearbeitung. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 432. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner. 1909. M. 11.

- Butler** (H. E.) Post-Augustan Poetry from Seneca to Juvenal. 9" x 5½". Pp. viii + 324. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Caesar.** Caesar's Invasions of Britain. (De Bello Gallico, Lib. IV. c. xx-V. c. xxxiii.) Edited, with introduction and notes, by the Rev. A. W. Upcott, D.D., and Arthur Reynolds, M.A. (*Bell's Illustrated Classics.*) 6¼" x 4". Pp. viii + 120 + xxxii. London, George Bell & Sons. 1909. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.
- Cancogni** (Domenico) Le Rovine del Palatino. Guida Storico-Artistica. Con prefazione del Prof. Rodolfo Lanciani. 6" x 4". Pp. xvi + 180, con una pianta, 44 tavole e 5 figure nel testo. Milano, Ulrico Hoepli. 1909. Linen, L. 3.50.
- Carotti** (Dr. G.) A History of Art; by Dr. G. Carotti. Vol. II. (Part I.). Early Christian and Neo-Oriental Art, European Art North of the Alps [The Middle Ages]. Translated by Beryl de Zoete. Revised by Mrs. S. Arthur Strong, Litt.D., LL.D. 6¾" x 4¾". Pp. xxii + 376, with 360 illustrations. London, Duckworth & Co. 1909. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Cauer** (Paul) Grundfragen der Homerikritik. Zweite, stark erweiterte und zum Teil umgearbeitete Auflage. 8¾" x 5¾". Pp. viii + 552. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 1909. geh. M. 12; geb. in Leinen. M. 13.35.
- Church** (J. E.), Junr. Adolf Furtwaengler. The Identity of the Child in Virgil's Pollio. On Vergil's Aeneid I., 249. A Defense of Propertius IV. 3, 47, 48. (*University of Nevada Studies.* Edited by the Committee on Publications. Vol. I. No. 2. 1908.) 9½" x 6". Pp. 61-98.
- Cicero.** M. Tulli Ciceronis Oratio pro M. Caelio. Recensuit atque interpretatus est Jacobus van Wageningen. 9¼" x 6¼". Pp. xxxiv + 120. Groningen, P. Noordhoff. 1908. Fl. 1.80; Mk. 3.
- Cicero.** Supplementum Ciceronianum. M. Tulli Ciceronis de virtutibus libri fragmenta, collegit Hermannus Knoellinger. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. vi + 96. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1908. geh. M. 2; geb. in Leinwand, M. 2.40.
- Classical Association.** Proceedings of the Classical Association, 1908. With Rules and List of Members. Vol. VI. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 188. London, John Murray. 1909. 2s. 6d. net.
- Curtius Rufus** (Quintus) Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt, iterum recensuit Edmundus Hedicke. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7¼" x 4¾". Editio Major. Pp. x + 404. geh. M. 3.60; geb. in Leinwand, 4.20. Editio Minor. Pp. xii + 312. geh. M. 1.20; geb. in Leinwand, 1.60. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1908.
- Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur.** Recensuit et apparatus criticum indices que adjecit Ed. Aloysius De Stefani. Fasc. 1. A-B. 10" x 6¾". Pp. 293. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. M. 10.
- Ferrero** (Guglielmo) The Greatness and Decline of Rome. Vol. V. The Republic of Augustus. By Guglielmo Ferrero. Translated by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor, M.A. 9" x 5¾". Pp. 372. London, William Heinemann. 1909. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Fowler** (W. Warde) Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xvi + 362. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Frank** (Tenney) A Chapter in the Story of Roman Imperialism. (*Reprinted from Classical Philology.* Vol. IV. No. 2. April, 1909.) 10" x 7". Pp. 118-138. Chicago, Published by the University of Chicago Press.
- Frothingham** (Arthur L.) The Monuments of Christian Rome from Constantine to the Renaissance. (*Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities.*) 8" x 5". Pp. 412. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1908. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Galenus.** Galeni de usu partium libri xvii ad codicum fidem recensuit Georgius Helmreich. Vol. II. Libros ix-xvii continens. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. vi + 486. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 8; geb. in Leinwand, M. 8.60.
- Grasserie** (Raoul de la) Essai d'une Sémantique intégrale. (*Études de linguistique et de psychologie linguistique.*) 7½" x 5". Tome I. Pp. 324. Tome II. Pp. 325-672. Paris, Ernest Leroux. 1908. Fr. 10.
- Hardy** (E. G.) Studies in Roman History. Second Series. 7¼" x 7¾". Pp. xii + 308, with a map. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1909. Cloth, 6s.
- Hense** (Otto) Teletis Reliquae, recognovit prolegomena scripsit Otto Hense. Editio secunda. 9¼" x 6". Pp. cxxiv + 108. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1909. M. 7.
- Hiller von Gaertringen** (F. Frhr.) Briefwechsel über eine attische Inschrift zwischen A. Boeckh und K. O. Mueller aus dem Jahre 1835. Als Ergänzung des 1883 erschienenen Briefwechsels der beiden Gelehrten mitgeteilt von F. F. Hiller von Gaertringen. 9¼" x 6". Pp. vi + 44, mit. 22 Abb. im Text. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1908. M. 2.
- Hogarth** (David G.) Ionia and the East. Six lectures delivered before the University of London. 9" x 5½". Pp. 118, with a map. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net. (£1.1s.)
- Homer.** The Iliad of Homer. Books IX, X. Translated into English Prose by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (*Bell's Classical Translations.*) 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. 213-276. London, George Bell & Sons. 1909. 1s.
- Homer.** La Question d'Homère. Les Poèmes Homériques, l'Archéologie et la Poésie populaire, par A. Van Gennep. Suivi d'une bibliographie critique par A. J. Reinach. (*Les Hommes et les Idées.* 10.) 7" x 4½". Pp. 86. Paris, Mercure de France. 1909. 75 c.
- Ilberg** (Johannes) und **Wellmann** (Max) Zwei Vorträge zur Geschichte der antiken Medizin. (*Sonderabdruck aus dem XXI. Bande der Neuen Jahrbücher für klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur.*) 10½" x 7". Pp. 585-703. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 1.40.

- Καρολίδης (Π.) τὰ Ἑλληνικά γράμματα κατὰ τοὺς χρό-
νους τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ. 12mo. Pp. 82.
Published by the σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων
βιβλίων. Athens, 1908. 50 centimes.
- Krause (Dr. Ernst) Diogenes von Apollonia.
Zweiter Teil. Mit einer Zeichnung des Ver-
fassers. Beilage zu dem Jahresberichte des
königlichen Gymnasiums zu Gnesen, Ostern, 1909.
1909. Zu Programm Nr. 224. 10½" × 8". Pp. 16.
Posen, Merzbachsche Buchdruckerei. 1909.
- Livy. Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri. Editionem
primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn. Editio
altera, quam curavit Guilelmus Heraeus. Pars
V. Fasc. 1. Liber xxxix-xl. (Bibl. Script. Gr.
et Rom. Teub.) 7¼" × 4¾". Pp. xvi + 112. Leipzig,
B. G. Teubner. 1908. geh. 85 Pf.; geb. in
Leinwand, M. 1.25.
- Marett (R. R.) The Threshold of Religion.
7½" × 5". Pp. xx + 174. London, Methuen & Co.
1909. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Merry (W. W.) Orationes tum Creweianae tum
Gratulatoriae in Theatro Sheldoniano plerumque
habitae, auctore W. W. Merry, D.D. 9¾" × 6¾".
Pp. 102. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth,
6s. net.
- Münchener Archäologische Studien dem Andenken
Adolf Furtwaenglers gewidmet. 10" × 7¼". Pp.
viii + 504. Munich, Oskar Beck. 1909. Linen
back, M. 25.
- Naylor (H. Darnley) Latin and English Idiom.
An Object Lesson from Livy's Preface. 7½" × 5".
Pp. viii + 72. Cambridge, University Press. 1909.
Cloth, 2s.
- Oppien d'Apamée. La Chasse. Édition critique
par Pierre Boudreaux. (Bibliothèque de l'École des
Hautes Études. Fasc. 172.) 10" × 6½". Pp. 152.
Paris, Librairie Honoré Champion. 1908. Fr. 7.
- Partsch (Josef) Griechisches Bürgerschaftsrecht. Teil
I. Das Recht des altgriechischen Gemeindestaats.
9½" × 6¼". Pp. x + 434. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G.
Teubner. 1909. M. 14.
- Plessis (Frédéric) La Poésie Latine (De Livius
Andronicus a Rutilius Namatianus). 9" × 5½".
Pp. xvi + 710. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck.
1909. Fr. 12.
- Proclus Diadochus. Procli Diadochi Hypotyposis
astronomicarum positionum. Una cum scholiis
antiquis e libris manu scriptis edidit Germanica
interpretatione et commentariis instruxit Carolus
Manitius. (Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.)
7½" × 4¾". Pp. xli + 378. Leipzig, B. G. Teub-
ner. 1909. geh. M. 8; geb. M. 8.60.
- Robert (Carl) Pausanias als Schriftsteller. Studien
und Beobachtungen von Carl Robert. 9¼" × 6¼".
Pp. 348, 2 Plänen und 7 Planskizzen im Text.
Berlin, Weidmann. 1909. M. 10.
- Roiron (F. X. M. J.) Etude sur l'Imagination
Auditive de Virgile. Thèse présentée à la Faculté
des Lettres de l'Université de Paris par F. X. M. J.
Roiron, S.J. 10" × 6½". Pp. iv + 690. Paris,
Ernest Leroux. 1908. Fr. 12.
- Ροίρων (Φ. Ξ. Μ. Ι.) Κριτικά και Εξηγητικά περι-
τρων Ουεργίλιου στίχων Α 10.857, 4.436, 6.242
κατα καινήν μεθόδον πειρασάμενος τῷ τῆς ἐν παρίοις
παναχαδμείας Μουσείῳ παρέθηκε Φ. Ξ. Μ. Ι.
Ροίρων. ἐκ τῆς Εταιρείας Ἰησού. 10" × 6½". Pp.
94. Paris, Ernest Leroux. 1908. Fr. 3.
- Schneider (Rudolf) Griechische Poliorketiker. Mit
den handschriftlichen Bildern herausgegeben und
übersetzt von Rudolf Schneider. II. (Abhand-
lungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissen-
schaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische
Klasse. Neue Folge. Band XI. Nro. 1.)
10¾" × 8¾". Pp. 110, mit 11 Tafeln. Berlin,
Weidmann. 1908. M. 9.
- Sihler (E. G.) Testimonium Animae, or Greek and
Roman before Jesus Christ. A Series of Essays
and Sketches dealing with the Spiritual Elements
in Classical Civilization; by E. G. S., Professor
of the Latin Language and Literature in the New
York University. 9" × 6". Pp. vii + 453. New
York, Stechert & Co. 1908. \$2.25 net, post
paid.
- Solmsen (Felix) Beiträge zur Griechischen Wort-
forschung. Teil I. 9¼" × 6". Pp. 270. Strassburg,
Carl J. Trübner. 1909. M. 9.
- Tacitus. Germania. Edited by J. F. Stout, B.A.
(The University Tutorial Series.) 7" × 4¾". Pp.
viii + 74. London, W. B. Clive. 1909. Cloth,
2s. 6d.
- Thiele (W.) De Severo Alexandro Imperatore;
scriptis Waltharius Thiele. 9¼" × 6". Pp.
xii + 132. Berlin, Mayer & Müller. 1909. M. 3.
- Traube (Ludwig) Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen
von Ludwig Traube. Herausgegeben von Franz
Boll. Band I. Zur Paläographie und Handschri-
tenkunde. 10" × 7". Pp. lxxvi + 264. Munich,
Oskar Beck. 1909. M. 15.
- Ullman (B. L.) Additions and Corrections to C.I.L.
(Reprinted from Classical Philology. Vol. IV.
No. 2. April, 1909.) 10" × 7". Pp. 190-198.
Published by the University of Chicago Press.
1909.
- Université de Paris. Bibliothèque de la Faculté des
Lettres. XXV. Mélanges d'Histoire Ancienne.
[I. G. Bloch: M. Aemilius Scaurus. II. J. Car-
copino: Histoire de l'Ostracisme Athénien. III.
L. Gernet: L'Approvisionnement d'Athènes en blé
au V^e et au VI^e siècles]. 9¾" × 6½". Pp. 392.
Paris, Felix Alcan. 1909. Fr. 12.50.
- Vollgraff (Wilhelm) Nikander und Ovid. Teil I.
9½" × 6¼". Pp. 144. Groningen, J. B. Wolters.
1909. Cloth, 5s.
- Watson (J. M.) Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato, by
the late J. M. Watson. 9" × 6". Pp. 88. Henry
Frowde, Oxford University Press. 1909. 3s. 6d.
net.
- Wessely (Dr. C.) Studien zur Palaeographie und
Papyruskunde, herausgegeben von Dr. C. W. VIII.
13¾" × 10½". Pp. 137-308. Leipzig, E. Avenarius.
1908. M. 8.
- Zottoli (Giampietro) Publio Paquio Proculo, Panat-
tiere e supremo magistrato Pompeiano. Nota di
G. Z. (Reale Accademia dei Lincei Estratto dal
Vol. XVII. Fasc. 7-9. 1908.) 9½" × 6". Pp. 22.
Roma, Tip. della R. Accademia dei Lincei. 1909.